# EXHIBIT 5

```
1
                UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2
               NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
3
                   SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
4
     -----x
5
     MAXIMILIAN KLEIN, et al., on :
6
     behalf of themselves and all :
7
     others similarly situated, : Case No.
8
                  Plaintiffs, : 3:20-cv-08570-JD
9
        v.
10
     META PLATFORMS, INC., a :
11
     Delaware corporation :
12
     headquartered in California, :
13
                 Defendant. :
14
     ----x
15
16
              Videotaped Virtual Deposition of
17
                     KEVIN KREITZMAN
18
                  Monday, October 2, 2023
19
                      9:08 a.m. CST
20
21
22
    Job No.: 509154
23
    Pages: 1 - 255
24
    Reported Stenographically by:
25
    Tiffany M. Pietrzyk, CSR RPR CRR
```

1	Videotaped virtual deposition of KEVIN
2	KREITZMAN, pursuant to notice, before Tiffany M.
3	Pietrzyk, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in the
4	States of Illinois, Texas, and California,
5	Registered Professional Reporter, Certified Realtime
6	Reporter, and a Notary Public in and for the State
7	of Illinois.
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

3

1 APPEARANCES 2 ON BEHALF OF THE ADVERTISER PLAINTIFFS and 3 PUTATIVE CLASS: AMANDA LAWRENCE, ESQUIRE 4 5 BRIAN DUNNE, ESQUIRE 6 SCOTT+SCOTT 7 156 South Main Street 8 P.O. Box 192 9 Colchester, Connecticut 06415 10 860.531.2645 11 12 ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANT: 13 SONAL MEHTA, ESQUIRE 14 ANDREW WAKS, ESQUIRE 15 WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE & DORR, LLP 16 2600 El Camino Real 17 Suite 400 18 Palo Alto, California 94306 19 650.858.6000 20 21 ALSO PRESENT: 22 Wei Zhao 23 Ilona Mostipan 24 Michelle Mejia, Planet Depos Remote Tech 25 Micah Hardin, Planet Depos Videographer

2	_

1	is that earning economic profit over a nontransient	09:50:34
2	period of time.	09:50:39
3	Q. Right. But what I'm getting at is, is that	09:50:40
4	economic profit just anything that's net positive,	09:50:44
5	or is there some numerical threshold above zero?	09:50:46
6	A. Again, I haven't seen any definitions that,	09:50:51
7	you know, quantify, you know, more than 2 percent or	09:50:55
8	3 percent or no, I've never seen that.	09:50:59
9	Q. With respect to your understanding of it, is	09:51:03
10	it your understanding then in that case where you're	09:51:05
11	talking about an economic profit over a nontransient	09:51:08
12	period of time, that that simply means a positive	09:51:14
13	profit, meaning something above zero?	09:51:16
14	A. Yes. I mean, practically, if it's a tiny	09:51:21
15	little bit, if it's a tenth a percent above zero,	09:51:26
16	there's probably not going to be a rush to enter	09:51:30
17	that into (audio distortion.)	09:51:34
18	Although someone might, you know, still	09:51:34
19	expand their business a little bit. So no, again, I	09:51:37
20	don't have a particular number. I've never looked	09:51:43
21	at it that way.	09:51:48
22	Q. So okay. So I just want to again make	09:51:50
23	sure that we're clear about this for the record. So	09:51:54
24	then if the judge and the jury in this case wanted	09:51:56
25	to know what the numerical threshold is for there to	09:51:59
		I

1	be a positive economic profit or an economic profit	09:52:03
2	for a nontransient period of time, do you have a	09:52:10
3	numerical threshold to offer to them?	09:52:13
4	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	09:52:16
5	A. You know, again, I'm just I just did the	09:52:18
6	calculations of what the economic profit is.	09:52:21
7	Q. So I take it the answer to that question was	09:52:27
8	no?	09:52:30
9	A. No, I don't have a not not giving any	09:52:31
10	guidelines as to what the cutoff point would be.	09:52:39
11	Q. Let's talk about some of the economic	09:52:45
12	some of the foundational economic principles and	09:52:50
13	make sure that you and I are on the same page about	09:52:54
14	them before we dig into your EPR analysis.	09:52:58
15	Would you agree with me that as a matter of	09:53:01
16	economics, high profits or net positive profits can	09:53:04
17	exist even for years for reasons unrelated to	09:53:08
18	anticompetitive conduct?	09:53:12
19	A. Yes.	09:53:14
20	Q. Would you agree with me that Meta could have	09:53:14
21	had higher profits than the yardstick firms because	09:53:18
22	they offered a superior product?	09:53:22
23	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	09:53:24
24	A. Again, there's a lot a lot of reasons why	09:53:28
25	companies have persistent market power.	09:53:32
		i .

2	7
	1

		1
1	Q. Right. And this particular case, you'd	09:53:37
2	agree with me that Meta could have had higher	09:53:41
3	profits than the yardstick firms because it offered	09:53:44
4	a superior product to those than those firms;	09:53:46
5	right?	09:53:48
6	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	09:53:48
7	A. Okay. So let me kind of back up a little	09:53:49
8	bit. And what I did was I calculated the amount of	09:54:03
9	economic profits earned by Meta. I didn't I	09:54:07
10	didn't go in and evaluate whether this was a result	09:54:17
11	of legal or illegal content. I have no opinion on	09:54:20
12	that.	09:54:25
13	Q. Okay. So fair. So you're saying you have	09:54:26
14	no opinion as to what the cause was for Meta's	09:54:30
15	the higher profit that you calculated that Meta had;	09:54:34
16	is that fair?	09:54:37
17	A. That's fair.	09:54:38
18	Q. Now, stepping back, you'd agree with me that	09:54:39
19	it is possible that one of the reasons that Meta had	09:54:45
20	higher profits than the yardstick firms, is they had	09:54:48
21	a superior product; right?	09:54:52
22	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	09:54:53
23	A. You know, anything is possible.	09:54:54
24	Q. And you haven't analyzed that and ruled that	09:54:58
25	out; right?	09:55:02
		1

•	
_	

		1
1	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	09:55:03
2	A. Again, I haven't I haven't analyzed and	09:55:06
3	tried to assign the reasons for economic profits. I	09:55:10
4	looked and measured and calculated the economic	09:55:20
5	profits.	09:55:22
6	Q. You have not you would agree with me that	09:55:22
7	it's possible that Meta could have had its higher	09:55:26
8	economic profits as a result of superior management	09:55:30
9	quality; right?	09:55:32
10	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	09:55:34
11	A. Again, I have not I have not done any	09:55:35
12	analysis of the source of the economic profits. And	09:55:42
13	when you say something is possible, I think you can	09:55:46
14	say, you know, anything is possible. I haven't	09:55:50
15	seen seen or analyzed any evidence of this.	09:55:58
16	Q. Correct. So	09:55:58
17	(Indiscernible crosstalk.)	09:55:58
18	A theoretical, you know, if you know,	09:56:03
19	what almost anything you can say, you can say	09:56:07
20	well, that's possible.	09:56:11
21	Q. Well, let's but let's be real here. I	09:56:13
22	mean, you are you are saying that you are an	09:56:16
23	expert in financial analysis, and you've obviously	09:56:20
24	had a lot of experience analyzing economic profits	09:56:24
25	across different firms and different industries.	09:56:27
		1

09:56:

		ı
1	And so I'm not asking you for, is anything	09:56:31
2	possible like you know	09:56:35
3	A. Yeah.	09:56:38
4	Q some like crazy outlier possibility.	09:56:39
5	I'm asking you about real-world economic	09:56:44
6	dynamics that you are an expert in, or you're	09:56:46
7	holding yourself out to be an expert in. So let's	09:56:50
8	be reasonable about what the bounds are of	09:56:53
9	possibility. That's what I'm asking you to do.	09:56:56
10	A. Yeah.	09:56:58
11	Q. You understand that in different industries,	09:56:59
12	that a company can have higher economic profits than	09:57:02
13	the yardstick firms because it has a superior	09:57:06
14	product; right? You've seen that? You know	09:57:10
15	that's	09:57:10
16	(Indiscernible crosstalk.)	09:57:13
17	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	09:57:13
18	A. You know, again, I don't I have not	09:57:26
19	analyzed the reasons for economic profits being	09:57:29
20	higher than something else or greater than zero.	09:57:38
21	Q. So you can't tell the judge and the jury in	09:57:43
22	this case that Meta's well, let me put it this	09:57:46
23	way.	09:57:52
24	You have no opinion with respect to whether	09:57:52
25	or not Meta's higher profits in this case resulted	09:57:54
		1

		$\sim$	
_	11	-	

1	from superior product quality; right?	09:57:56
2	A. No, I have no opinion on that.	09:58:01
3	Q. And so you can't suggest to the judge and	09:58:03
4	jury that Meta's higher profits aren't caused by	09:58:07
5	higher product quality, can you?	09:58:13
6	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	09:58:15
7	A. Again, I have not tried to isolate sources	09:58:16
8	of economic profits. I calculated what they were.	09:58:24
9	Q. And is that also true for superior	09:58:29
10	management quality? You have not analyzed whether	09:58:31
11	or not Meta's higher economic profits are a result	09:58:36
12	of superior management quality; correct?	09:58:39
13	A. Again, I have not done that analysis.	09:58:42
14	Q. So you can't say that that's not the cause	09:58:44
15	for the higher profits; right?	09:58:46
16	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	09:58:48
17	A. I've I have not done that analysis, so	09:58:49
18	I'm not I'm not going to give opinions on things	09:58:52
19	I haven't done, no.	09:58:54
20	Q. Okay. It's also true then that you haven't	09:58:55
21	analyzed whether or not Meta's higher economic	09:58:59
22	profits are a result of superior human capital;	09:59:03
23	correct?	09:59:08
24	A. Really the same answer. I haven't I have	09:59:08
25	not tried to assign sources and causes of the	09:59:11
		Ī

41

1 09:59:20 economic profits. 2 09:59:20 Q. So that's true for superior human capital as 3 well; right? 09:59:26 09:59:26 A. Yes. 09:59:27 5 Q. And that's also true for -- well, let me ask 6 09:59:30 the question more completely. 7 09:59:31 You have not analyzed whether or not Meta's 8 09:59:34 higher profits could be attributable to or caused by 9 09:59:39 effective product differentiation; correct? 10 09:59:44 A. Okay. So kind of the same answer again. I 09:59:47 11 did not -- I did not go through and try to assign 09:59:52 12 sources of economic profits to the risk factors. 13 09:59:57 Q. Right. And that's true for product 09:59:59 14 differentiation as a potential cause for higher 10:00:02 15 profits; right? 10:00:03 16 A. Yes, I have not -- I have not done that 17 10:00:06 analysis. 10:00:07 18 Q. And you have not analyzed whether or not 19 10:00:10 Meta's higher profits result from wise investment 10:00:18 20 and product innovation; right? 10:00:20 21 A. I haven't done that analysis. 22 10:00:21 Q. And you have not analyzed whether or not 23 Meta's higher profits might result from alleged 10:00:24 10:00:28 24 anticompetitive conduct unrelated to the advertiser 25 10:00:31 plaintiffs' claims; right?

		1
1	A. I have not done that analysis.	10:00:33
2	Q. Now, you also have not analyzed whether or	10:00:35
3	not Meta's ad revenues could be so I'm setting	10:00:46
4	aside profits for a moment.	10:00:51
5	A. Yeah.	10:00:51
6	Q. I'm talking about ad revenues.	10:00:52
7	You have not analyzed whether or not Meta's	10:00:54
8	ad revenues are attributable to factors like	10:00:56
9	superior product, superior management quality,	10:01:00
10	superior human capital, product differentiation, or	10:01:03
11	innovation; correct?	10:01:07
12	A. Yes. Once again, I did not I did not	10:01:13
13	look for sources of economic profits. I calculated	10:01:17
14	what they were.	10:01:23
15	Q. Right. But I'm talking about ad revenues	10:01:24
16	right now. You have not analyzed whether or not or	10:01:26
17	the extent to which Meta's ad revenues are driven by	10:01:28
18	those factors; correct?	10:01:34
19	A. Again, I did not look at that, yes.	10:01:37
20	Q. And is it also fair to say that in your	10:01:41
21	economic profit analysis, you did not adjust your	10:01:44
22	calculations to account for those factors: Superior	10:01:49
23	product, superior management quality, superior human	10:01:53
24	capital, product differentiation, or product	10:01:57
25	innovation?	10:02:00
		4

,	1	2	
4	ŧ	.)	

1	A. There was nothing to adjust. The economic	10:02:01
2	profits are based on the cash flows. The cash flows	10:02:07
3	in, the modern capital, these other factors, so	10:02:14
4	there were no adjustments to make for any of those	10:02:19
5	factors in my calculations.	10:02:23
6	Q. And then with respect to your selection	10:02:24
7	criteria, did you specifically adjust for or design	10:02:30
8	for your selection criteria to select firms that	10:02:39
9	were comparable to Meta on those dimensions that I	10:02:44
10	just mentioned: Superior product, superior	10:02:48
11	management quality, superior human capital, product	10:02:53
12	differentiation, or product innovation?	10:02:58
13	A. No, and I guess we're assuming that all	10:03:00
14	these things were superior. I didn't look at them	10:03:13
15	at all, so I didn't say that again, I did not	10:03:15
16	look at the source. I calculated the economic	10:03:21
17	profits.	10:03:23
18	Q. Okay. But what I'm asking is, those five	10:03:23
19	criteria that I just mentioned: Product quality,	10:03:26
20	management quality, human capital, product	10:03:29
21	differentiation, and innovation, those are not	10:03:31
22	criteria that you adjusted for in your selection	10:03:34
23	criteria in order to select firms that were	10:03:39
24	comparable to Meta on those five dimensions;	10:03:42
25	correct?	10:03:48

1	1
4	4

1	A. No, those were not in the we had I	10:03:48
2	think we were very clear on what the six criteria	10:03:52
3	were. So if it wasn't one of those, then it's it	10:03:54
4	wasn't one of the selection criteria.	10:04:01
5	Q. Right. And what I guess I want to be very	10:04:03
6	clear about so that there's no confusion down the	10:04:06
7	road is, the five criteria I just mentioned, product	10:04:10
8	quality, management quality, human capital, product	10:04:13
9	innovation, and product differentiation, those are	10:04:17
10	not in the six criteria that you selected for;	10:04:19
11	correct?	10:04:23
12	A. Well, I mean, in order to have criteria,	10:04:23
13	they need to be things that you can measure and can	10:04:26
14	get information on.	10:04:28
15	Q. Right. And so they were not part of your	10:04:30
16	six selection criteria?	10:04:33
17	A. No.	10:04:35
18	Q. Is that right?	10:04:37
19	A. Well, no, there would be no practical way to	10:04:41
20	say management quality.	10:04:45
21	Q. Okay. So	10:04:49
22	A. Yeah. To me, it's an odd question because	10:04:52
23	I'm not using criteria that couldn't be used.	10:04:56
24	Q. Yeah, because of the way the question was	10:05:01
25	asked this is on me the transcript might be a	10:05:04
		1

	1	£	•
4	ŧ	Э	)

1	little muddy. So I want this to be clear. I'm	10:05:07
2	gonna try to ask it in a way where you can answer it	10:05:10
3	and it will be very clear what the answer is.	10:05:13
4	So the five criteria that I just mentioned,	10:05:15
5	product quality, management quality, human capital,	10:05:19
6	product differentiation, and product innovation,	10:05:23
7	those are not criteria that you used to select the	10:05:25
8	comparable firms; is that correct?	10:05:29
9	A. Yeah. Those are not criteria that could be	10:05:32
10	used.	10:05:35
11	Q. And the reason you're saying that is because	10:05:37
12	those are qualitative and not quantitative criteria;	10:05:40
13	is that your testimony?	10:05:44
14	A. Let me think if that is you can put it	10:05:45
15	that simply. Well, they're not things that could	10:05:57
16	be there would be no basis for reasonably	10:06:02
17	estimating them.	10:06:07
18	Q. Okay. Now, apart from the selection	10:06:09
19	criteria, so I know your selection criteria did not	10:06:12
20	factor those five things in. Apart from that, did	10:06:15
21	your economic profits analysis factor in or adjust	10:06:19
22	for the five criteria that I just mentioned,	10:06:23
23	superior product or product quality, management	10:06:26
24	quality, human capital, product differentiation, or	10:06:29
25	product innovation, in any way?	10:06:32

1	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	10:06:35
2	A. Again, it's a calculation. And it's a	10:06:36
3	calculation of the profits earned by Meta or	10:06:43
4	whatever company compared to its cost to capital.	10:06:52
5	Those are the things that are used for calculating	10:06:57
6	economic profit. There's no adjustments to make	10:07:01
7	anywhere. The economic profit is what it is	10:07:06
8	regardless of the source.	10:07:08
9	Q. Okay. Maybe I can ask the question a little	10:07:10
10	bit differently. I think I understand what you're	10:07:12
11	saying.	10:07:15
12	In your identification of the yardstick	10:07:16
13	firms, did you make any adjustments or otherwise	10:07:19
14	consider product quality, management quality, human	10:07:25
15	capital, product differentiation, or product	10:07:29
16	innovation in selecting those comparable firms?	10:07:32
17	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	10:07:35
18	A. Well, those would have been wouldn't	10:07:38
19	necessarily have been a very subjective set of	10:07:43
20	criteria. So no, it's not the type of thing that	10:07:48
21	would work as a criteria. Or an adjustment to a	10:07:55
22	criteria.	10:07:58
23	Q. So the answer to my question is no, that's	10:07:59
24	not something that you considered or adjusted for;	10:08:01
25	correct?	10:08:04

Q. Now, is it also fair, then, that nothing in

your opinion excludes the possibility that those

capital, product differentiation, and product

innovation, are the cause for Meta's profits?

MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.

factors, product quality, management quality, human

10:08:04 10:08:05 10:08:11 10:08:15 10:08:20 10:08:22 10:08:28 10:08:38

10:08:41

10:08:46

10:08:48

10:08:50

10:08:57

10:09:01

10:09:07

10:09:09

10:09:13

10:09:16

10:09:19

10:09:22

10:09:27

10:09:29

10:09:34

10:09:37

A. Okay. So, again, the calculation, it's -
I'm gonna give the same answer no matter what the

cause was. It's --

A. Correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Right. My --

A. Yeah, so it's -- it's the profits compared to the weighted average cost of capital. So those things wouldn't be included in a calculation -- in the estimation of economic profits.

Q. Right. But let's go back to my question.

Given what you just said, nothing in your opinion

would exclude the possibility that those other

factors, product quality, management quality, human

capital, product differentiation, and product

innovation, are the cause for Meta's profits; right?

MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.

A. Again, I didn't just find anything as to the cause of the economic profits. I measured what they were. So --

PLANET DEPOS

	$\mathbf{c}$
4	×
_	o

		1
1	Q. Right. So your opinion doesn't exclude the	10:09:41
2	possibility that those would be the causes; right?	10:09:45
3	A. No, my opinion is just what the economic	10:09:48
4	profits are.	10:09:50
5	Q. And is it also true that your opinion does	10:09:51
6	not exclude the possibility that the excess economic	10:09:56
7	profits, or the higher economic profits that you	10:10:00
8	calculate relative to the yardsticks are caused by	10:10:03
9	those other five factors?	10:10:07
10	A. Kind of the same answer again. I didn't	10:10:12
11	I did not do any analysis as to what was the cause	10:10:18
12	of economic profits or excess economic profits.	10:10:23
13	Q. Now, going, again, back to sort of your	10:10:27
14	understanding of the foundational economic	10:10:32
15	principles, you would agree with me that it is	10:10:36
16	possible for firms in competitive industries to have	10:10:39
17	positive economic profit; right?	10:10:41
18	A. Are we talking I mean, in a in a	10:10:45
19	theoretically perfectly competitive industry and	10:10:52
20	equilibrium, I suppose there could still be some	10:11:00
21	that have a slight advantage over others. So there	10:11:05
22	can be there can be some economic profits in	10:11:08
23	in kind of in the real world where there's	10:11:11
24	competition but not perfect competition.	10:11:17
25	Q. Okay. And you would agree with me well,	10:11:19
		1

-	
h	
v	•

		1
1	about whether or not the sorry.	10:52:27
2	That criteria, net positive income, doesn't	10:52:31
3	actually tell you anything about the comparability	10:52:35
4	of a firm to Meta in terms of lifecycle; right?	10:52:37
5	A. Specifically, no.	10:52:41
6	Q. Okay. I had asked you a little while ago	10:52:42
7	about yardstick analysis of profits being used to	10:52:58
8	derive conclusions about pricing.	10:53:00
9	Are you aware of any academic literature or	10:53:04
10	scholarship in which it is suggested that you can	10:53:13
11	use a yardstick methodology on profits to determine	10:53:14
12	pricing?	10:53:18
13	A. Again, that's not something that I	10:53:28
14	addressed, and that's something that would be more	10:53:32
15	appropriate to ask Michael Williams.	10:53:36
16	Q. Right. My question was, are you aware of	10:53:41
17	any such scholarship?	10:53:45
18	A. As I sit here, I can't think of anything.	10:53:49
19	Q. Let's talk about the specific selection	10:53:52
20	criteria that you used. So with respect to well,	10:54:19
21	why don't we go ahead and mark your report so that	10:54:25
22	you have it. So I'm gonna have you open I'm	10:54:30
23	gonna have you get out your opening report, which is	10:54:33
24	tab 1.	10:54:36
25	A. Okay.	10:54:38
		4

1	Q. And I'm gonna mark that as exhibit number	10:54:39
2	one second Kreitzman 33. So your opening report	10:54:44
3	will be Kreitzman 33. That's tab 1.	10:54:54
4	(Exhibit 33 was marked for identification	10:54:54
5	and is attached to the transcript.)	10:55:06
6	Q. Then I'm also gonna go ahead and have you	10:55:06
7	open and take out your reply report, which is tab 2.	10:55:01
8	And we're gonna mark that as Kreitzman 34.	10:55:07
9	(Exhibit 34 was marked for identification	10:55:07
10	and is attached to the transcript.)	10:55:21
11	Q. And let me know when you have those out.	10:55:21
12	MS. LAWRENCE: Can you give me a second,	10:55:25
13	please, as well?	10:55:26
14	MS. MEHTA: Yep, no problem.	10:55:27
15	MS. LAWRENCE: Okay. I'm set.	10:56:21
16	Are you, Kevin?	10:56:22
17	THE WITNESS: Yes.	10:56:23
18	BY MS. MEHTA:	10:56:25
19	Q. Okay. And, actually, before we get to the	10:56:25
20	specific criteria, I just had a couple of additional	10:56:28
21	questions for you. The first is, in evaluating the	10:56:30
22	difference between the profits that you calculated	10:56:37
23	for Meta and for your yardstick firms, is it your	10:56:39
24	opinion that revenue reduction is the only way that	10:56:42
25	Meta's profits could be brought in line with the	10:56:47

69 1 10:56:50 vardstick firms? 2 10:56:56 MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form. 10:56:58 3 A. No, I don't believe that I've offered that 10:57:02 4 opinion. 10:57:04 5 Q. You'd agree with me that an increase in 6 10:57:08 Meta's costs could also reduce Meta's economic 10:57:11 7 profits; right? 8 10:57:12 MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form. 9 10:57:13 A. Yes. 10 10:57:13 Q. And an increase in costs could be sufficient 10:57:19 11 to actually bring Meta's profits in line with the 10:57:23 12 yardstick firms; right? 13 10:57:25 MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form. 10:57:27 14 A. Again, profits are a function of revenues 10:57:33 15 and costs and expenses. 10:57:34 16 Q. So the answer to my question is yes, Meta's 17 10:57:38 costs could be increased to get to the level of 10:57:42 18 profitability of the yardstick firms; right? 19 10:57:43 A. Yes. Again, profits are an interaction of 10:57:47 20 these different things, yes. 21 Q. Could we go to paragraph 30 of your report? 10:57:50 22 10:58:11 MS. LAWRENCE: Of the opening, Sonal? 23 MS. MEHTA: Yes. 10:58:13 10:58:29 24 A. Got it.

> PLANET DEPOS 888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Q. Okay. Great. So in your opening report,

10:58:29

1	you say you employ a U.S. exchange filter; correct?	10:58:32
2	A. Yeah, so it included all the U.S. I	10:58:39
3	probably should have said it's the publicly traded	10:58:47
4	companies. It was a larger database than strictly	10:58:50
5	U.S.	10:58:53
6	Q. Right. And in your reply report, you	10:58:53
7	clarify that, in fact, it was companies that were	10:58:56
8	publicly traded anywhere in the world; right?	10:58:59
9	A. Yes.	10:59:01
10	Q. Now, as I understand it, your reasoning for	10:59:01
11	selecting on publicly traded companies is that you	10:59:05
12	would not have access to the same level of financial	10:59:11
13	information for privately traded firms; is that	10:59:15
14	right?	10:59:18
15	A. Yes.	10:59:18
16	Q. Did you consider whether there were other	10:59:20
17	criteria besides publicly traded or privately traded	10:59:24
18	that would enable you to conduct your analysis	10:59:28
19	that would give you sufficient information to	10:59:34
20	conduct your analysis?	10:59:36
21	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	10:59:36
22	A. Again, I'm not quite sure. The public	10:59:38
23	companies are required to file financial	10:59:48
24	information, and the private companies are not.	10:59:52
25	Generally, I would think that it's, you know, very	11:00:01

1	difficult and very unreliable to get information on	11:00:06
2	the financials of private companies. So I didn't	11:00:10
3	consider trying to track down private companies and	11:00:15
4	somehow get the information that no, I did not	11:00:21
5	look for other ways of getting information other	11:00:29
6	than information which is available from public	11:00:32
7	sources.	11:00:37
8	Q. Now, the ability to access the information,	11:00:50
9	in other words, whether or not that information is	11:00:54
10	reliably available because it's a public company or	11:00:57
11	not reliably available because it's a private	11:01:00
12	company, that itself doesn't say anything about the	11:01:03
13	comparability of the firm to Meta; correct?	11:01:07
14	A. That's true, yes.	11:01:10
15	Q. Now, let's talk about Google for a moment.	11:01:11
16	In your report, you say that Google that you	11:01:14
17	tried to isolate Google ads from other segments of	11:01:18
18	Alphabet's business that are not dependent on ad	11:01:22
19	revenue; right?	11:01:26
20	A. Yes.	11:01:27
21	Q. And you would agree with me that well,	11:01:27
22	strike that.	11:01:36
23	You attempted to account for that in your	11:01:37
24	calculation of Google's EPR; right?	11:01:40
25	A. Yes.	11:01:43
		I

		i
1	Q. And could you tell me, at a high level, how	11:01:43
2	you attempted to do that?	11:01:47
3	A. Well, Google actually provided quite a bit	11:01:50
4	of information on certain segments of its business.	11:01:57
5	There's a part, which is Google Cloud and I think	11:02:01
6	they called it Other Bets where they were just	11:02:11
7	investing in all sorts of unrelated companies. And	11:02:14
8	these things were provided revenue, provided	11:02:17
9	operating profits. So I had enough information that	11:02:25
10	I could take this out of the profitability and	11:02:29
11	adjust for it in Alphabet's financial statements.	11:02:36
12	Q. And when you say you had enough information,	11:02:45
13	you're referring to their public filings, their	11:02:48
14	10-Ks?	11:02:51
15	A. Yes.	11:02:51
16	Q. Did you evaluate 10-Ks to break out	11:02:52
17	advertising segments for any company besides Google?	11:02:56
18	A. No, I didn't well, certainly for Meta but	11:03:13
19	not for the other companies.	11:03:24
20	Q. So in terms of whether or not there were	11:03:29
21	other firms that also broke out advertising revenue	11:03:31
22	or advertising segments besides Google and Meta,	11:03:36
23	that's not something you looked into; correct?	11:03:39
24	A. I don't recall exactly how that was looked	11:03:48
25	at. I don't remember seeing things that would have	11:03:50
		i

_

1	you did not, as part of your methodology, look at	11:07:23
2	the 10-Ks for the other firms that you considered to	11:07:27
3	see whether they broke out advertising revenue or	11:07:30
4	advertising segments; right?	11:07:32
5	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	11:07:35
6	A. You know, again, I'm going to have to, you	11:07:35
7	know, come back to the criteria that I used, and it	11:07:49
8	wasn't a criteria to go in and look for I guess	11:07:52
9	I'm trying to understand what you're asking, but	11:07:59
10	it's did we go in and look for other companies	11:08:01
11	that would break out the ads or the non-ad segments	11:08:07
12	to the extent where they could be included? No,	11:08:13
13	that wasn't a specific criteria.	11:08:23
14	Q. So that's not something that you did; right?	11:08:26
15	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	11:08:29
16	A. Again, I looked at a lot of things. I	11:08:29
17	looked at a lot of these other companies. And I	11:08:35
18	didn't specifically search for that. Would I have	11:08:43
19	seen it when I looked at them? But, again, that	11:08:48
20	wasn't part of the criteria. The six criteria	11:08:58
21	measures. I didn't go in and see, you know, did	11:09:01
22	they have an actual	11:09:04
23	THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. Could you repeat	11:09:04
24	the end?	11:09:04
25	A. I didn't go and look at companies and see if	11:09:13

•

		1
1	they had adequate segment information to do analysis	11:09:16
2	of just that piece of the company, but I didn't	11:09:25
3	probably the main reason is I wouldn't expect to	11:09:30
4	find anything.	11:09:33
5	Q. But that's not something that you did;	11:09:34
6	right?	11:09:38
7	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	11:09:38
8	Q. Is that right?	11:09:40
9	A. Again, I didn't specifically use that as a	11:09:44
10	screen	11:09:46
11	Q. Now	11:09:48
12	A criteria, yeah.	11:09:51
13	Q. Now there were is it fair to say that if	11:09:54
14	there were a private firm, privately traded firm or	11:10:04
15	privately held firm, I should say, that is at least	11:10:08
16	as comparable to Meta or more comparable to Meta	11:10:13
17	than your yardstick firms, that that would not be	11:10:20
18	something that you would have you would've found	11:10:23
19	in your analysis?	11:10:23
20	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	11:10:26
21	A. A private company would not be found in my	11:10:33
22	analysis.	11:10:38
23	Q. So it's possible that there are privately	11:10:38
24	held firms that are at least as comparable or more	11:10:42
25	comparable to Meta than the yardstick firms that you	11:10:45
		4

1	identified that are excluded from your analysis;	11:10:48
2	correct?	11:10:52
3	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	11:10:52
4	A. Again, you can say anything is possible. I	11:10:56
5	did not look for private companies as potential	11:11:02
6	comps. So if there so whatever is in that sample	11:11:12
7	size, I really have not evaluated.	11:11:14
8	Q. Let's talk about the industry filter that	11:11:16
9	you just or that you employed.	11:11:22
10	A. Uh-huh.	11:11:26
11	Q. Now, as I understand it, you used a filter	11:11:26
12	or an industry segment that was identified by CapIQ;	11:11:32
13	is that right?	11:11:37
14	A. Yes.	11:11:37
15	Q. Okay. And as I understand it, that filter	11:11:38
16	is set to or selected to limit the well, maybe I	11:11:42
17	shouldn't say limit.	11:11:49
18	That industry filter was a criteria that was	11:11:51
19	used to identify companies that rely on	11:11:55
20	pay-per-click advertisements for their primary	11:12:00
21	revenue source; correct?	11:12:03
22	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	11:12:04
23	A. Well, that I think you're referring to	11:12:08
24	the CapIQ definition.	11:12:10
25	Q. Yes.	11:12:13
		I

1	A. And so I'm not I didn't really rely on	11:12:14
2	that definition. So the second criteria, the	11:12:25
3	interactive media services, this is the category	11:12:43
4	that Meta was in, so these are industries that were	11:12:50
5	in the same category as Meta. Their primary and	11:12:54
6	it's the interactive media and services, which would	11:13:02
7	pick up things like companies that are on the	11:13:11
8	internet that were selling ads and had other	11:13:22
9	services as well.	11:13:28
10	Q. Let's go to paragraph 27 of your reply	11:13:32
11	report, please.	11:13:35
12	A. Yeah.	11:13:36
13	Q. Are you there?	11:13:50
14	A. Yes.	11:13:50
15	Q. In paragraph 27, you're talking about the	11:13:50
16	industry filter; right?	11:13:53
17	A. Oh, I'm sorry. The reply report. I was	11:13:58
18	looking	11:14:00
19	Q. The reply report. Yeah.	11:14:01
20	A. I was gonna say that doesn't look familiar.	11:14:02
21	Well, my fingers are still a little numb here. I'm	11:14:15
22	a little slow at turning the pages.	11:14:23
23	Q. It's page 15.	11:14:25
24	A. Yep.	11:14:26
25	Q. You there?	11:14:29
		I

1	A. Yes.	11:14:30
2	Q. Okay. So just to orient you, if you look at	11:14:31
3	the heading B that's right above paragraph 27, it's	11:14:34
4	talking about the industry filter; right?	11:14:38
5	A. Yeah.	11:14:40
6	Q. Okay. And then if you look down at	11:14:40
7	paragraph 27, you say, [As read] As discussed in my	11:14:42
8	opening report, an important criterion for selecting	11:14:47
9	potential comparable firms is to evaluate companies,	11:14:50
10	like Meta, that engage in, quote engage, quote,	11:14:54
11	in content and information or distribution through	11:14:59
12	proprietary platforms, where revenues are derived	11:15:01
13	primarily through pay-per-click advertisements.	11:15:06
14	Do you see that?	11:15:09
15	A. Yeah. Again, this is this is a quote of	11:15:10
16	the CapIQ definition of category.	11:15:14
17	Q. Right. And	11:15:22
18	A. If we continue on there, it includes search	11:15:24
19	engines, social media, and networking platforms,	11:15:26
20	online classified and online reviews. So this is	11:15:32
21	the industry group that would capture companies that	11:15:35
22	have online online presence and do does	11:15:42
23	advertising.	11:15:48
24	Q. Right. And my question was, that was your	11:15:49
25	understanding of the definition of the interactive	11:15:51
		1

1	media and services industry that CapIQ that you	11:15:58
2	used from CapIQ; right?	11:16:03
3	A. So you're I mean, the when I look at	11:16:16
4	the definition, again, if you look at pay-per-click,	11:16:18
5	I mean, there were a lot of companies in there that	11:16:28
6	were not pay-per-click per se, but they were online	11:16:31
7	and had online classifieds. So I wouldn't focus too	11:16:34
8	much on that.	11:16:39
9	I would focus on what's included in the	11:16:40
10	industry category, which would be companies that	11:16:42
11	would potentially meet the criteria to be in the	11:16:47
12	yardstick.	11:16:52
13	Q. Do you know what criteria CapIQ uses to	11:16:53
14	identify the members of that group?	11:17:03
15	A. So in the industry classifications, you	11:17:07
16	know, there's different there's different ways	11:17:16
17	that companies are put in these classifications. I	11:17:19
18	couldn't speak to exactly what the CapIQ method is.	11:17:23
19	You know, they tend to be based on the SIC and the	11:17:32
20	NAIC codes. And sometimes those are self-reported.	11:17:37
21	Sometimes they're based on competitors and other	11:17:45
22	things. But I don't have I can't say that I know	11:17:50
23	exactly the criteria that was used to put all of	11:17:56
24	these companies into this category by CapIQ.	11:17:59
25	Q. Right. And as I understood your testimony a	11:18:03

1	moment ago, even the definition that CapIQ provides	11:18:05
2	for that industry segment isn't completely accurate	11:18:08
3	because you found there were companies in that	11:18:12
4	industry segment that did not have the majority of	11:18:14
5	their revenues from pay-per-click advertising;	11:18:16
6	correct?	11:18:19
7	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	11:18:19
8	A. Again, the you know, the interactive	11:18:23
9	media services and the definition provided by CapIQ,	11:18:28
10	again, I didn't I don't have I'm not really	11:18:37
11	offering an opinion as to how accurate their	11:18:40
12	description was, rather that this category included	11:18:43
13	the companies that would be potential yardstick	11:18:49
14	companies.	11:18:53
15	Q. No, I get	11:18:54
16	A. I would go towards the second part of that	11:18:55
17	definition much more than the first part as to	11:18:59
18	what's included in the category.	11:19:02
19	Q. Right. But you don't actually know what	11:19:04
20	criteria they used to decide who goes into that	11:19:07
21	category; right?	11:19:09
22	A. Again, no, I wasn't I don't know exactly	11:19:11
23	what they used as a criteria for that category.	11:19:15
24	Q. And even as to the second part of that	11:19:19
25	definition, you don't know whether or not there are	11:19:25
		1

11:19:3

		i
1	search engines or companies that operate in the	11:19:31
2	search engine segment that might be classified in	11:19:34
3	one of their other industry segments; correct?	11:19:37
4	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	11:19:42
5	A. Well, again, companies will sometimes have	11:19:44
6	many different classifications that they are	11:19:49
7	included in. And this is the primary. So this is	11:19:53
8	kind of what they do the most of.	11:19:57
9	Q. Right. My point is	11:20:00
10	A. So	11:20:00
11	Q. I'm sorry. Go ahead.	11:20:03
12	A. So there can be other companies that have	11:20:04
13	this as part of their business, but they are not	11:20:09
14	primarily in that business.	11:20:13
15	Q. Right. So there could be companies that are	11:20:15
16	in let's use social media networking, which is	11:20:19
17	another one of their listed categories. There could	11:20:25
18	be companies that are social media and networking	11:20:28
19	platforms that are not in this segment based on	11:20:30
20	whatever CapIQ's criteria is for assigning segments;	11:20:34
21	correct?	11:20:40
22	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	11:20:40
23	A. Can you say that again? The	11:20:41
24	Q. There could be companies that are social	11:20:47
25	media networking platforms. Let me rephrase	11:20:50
		İ

1	there aren't firms that are primarily social media	11:22:19
2	networking services or platforms but were otherwise	11:22:22
3	excluded for some other reason; right?	11:22:25
4	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	11:22:28
5	A. So could there have been some other	11:22:39
6	companies somewhere among the many, many thousands	11:22:44
7	of companies that got put into a different	11:22:46
8	classification or was misclassified? I would	11:22:50
9	suppose that's a possibility. Again, I don't know	11:22:59
10	that there would be a practical screen to pick it	11:23:04
11	up.	11:23:08
12	Q. Right. I'm not talking about	11:23:08
13	misclassification. I'm sure misclassification is a	11:23:10
14	possibility, and I assume you have no way to verify	11:23:14
15	that there wasn't misclassification here; right?	11:23:16
16	A. Right.	11:23:20
17	Q. Okay. Now, set aside misclassification.	11:23:20
18	Even in the case of a proper classification, because	11:23:25
19	you don't know CapIQ's criteria, you can't say that	11:23:28
20	there aren't firms actually, this is a lot of	11:23:33
21	negatives so let me try the question a little	11:23:37
22	differently.	11:23:39
23	Because you don't know CapIQ's criteria,	11:23:39
24	it's fair to say that it's possible that there is a	11:23:44
25	firm that has its primary business in the social	11:23:49
		1

O	_
ð	Э

1	media and networking platform space but that is	11:23:57
2	still categorized in a different industry segment by	11:24:00
3	CapIQ based on some other criteria; right?	11:24:04
4	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	11:24:06
5	A. You know, in looking through the different	11:24:08
6	classifications, I didn't see any that I thought	11:24:14
7	would likely contain such a company. But, again,	11:24:19
8	you know, it's possible there could be something	11:24:28
9	else, but this particular industry classification	11:24:32
10	contained the companies that were most likely to be	11:24:37
11	comparable to Meta.	11:24:43
12	Q. Well, no, that's not an answer to my	11:24:46
13	question. My question was, because you don't know	11:24:48
14	CapIQ's criteria well, actually, strike that.	11:24:50
15	It is possible, isn't it, Mr. Kreitzman,	11:24:59
16	that there are firms, including firms that have a	11:25:04
17	primary business in the social networking and	11:25:07
18	media let me use the exact language.	11:25:12
19	It is possible, Mr. Kreitzman, that there	11:25:17
20	are firms that have a primary business in social	11:25:21
21	media and networking that are outside of the	11:25:23
22	interactive media and services category based on	11:25:35
23	some other criteria; right?	11:25:39
24	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	11:25:42
25	A. Again, I wouldn't expect to see that, but,	11:25:49
		1

	-
•	_
$\sim$	m

		1
1	again, there's something I guess you could say	11:25:52
2	it's possible. I wouldn't know what other	11:25:55
3	categories we would find such a company, but	11:25:58
4	Q. Did you look at each of the other categories	11:26:05
5	or industry segments from CapIQ and each of the	11:26:08
6	member firms in those segments?	11:26:14
7	A. Did I look at each of the I would say no.	11:26:17
8	I mean, there are certain things that are oil and	11:26:26
9	gas services or financial services, or there's a lot	11:26:29
10	of things that would not require any further	11:26:32
11	investigation. So no, I didn't I didn't see any	11:26:42
12	other category descriptions that would be a	11:26:51
13	possibility for finding.	11:26:58
14	Q. Right. So let's take a step back, though.	11:26:59
15	So I understand that you didn't look at oil and gas.	11:27:02
16	That seems reasonable to me as well. I'll concede	11:27:06
17	that much.	11:27:10
18	A. Yeah.	11:27:10
19	Q. But did you look at all of the other	11:27:11
20	industry segments for CapIQ that are in the online	11:27:15
21	or internet space or that could be for online	11:27:18
22	advertising?	11:27:23
23	A. I mean, we looked at we looked at the	11:27:27
24	the definitions and didn't see any that seemed to be	11:27:35
25	good possibilities.	11:27:39
		i

1	Q. But you didn't look at the actual member	11:27:39
2	companies or firms that are in those categories;	11:27:41
3	right?	11:27:45
4	A. No.	11:27:45
5	Q. Is that right?	11:27:46
6	A. Yes.	11:27:47
7	Q. Now, as to the definition, I think we've	11:27:47
8	already talked about the fact that you don't know	11:27:51
9	for sure whether the definition provided for	11:27:53
10	interactive media and services actually relates to	11:27:56
11	the criteria used to put firms in that category;	11:27:58
12	right?	11:28:05
13	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	11:28:05
14	A. I mean, we can look at the firms in the	11:28:05
15	categories, if they do.	11:28:12
16	Q. Right. But you've already testified that	11:28:18
17	some of the firms in the category don't meet at	11:28:20
18	least one part of the definition CapIQ provided;	11:28:23
19	right?	11:28:26
20	A. Yeah.	11:28:26
21	Q. So with respect to the other industry	11:28:27
22	segments, whether or not the definition that you	11:28:29
23	looked at is an accurate definition of what firms	11:28:32
24	are put in those other categories, that's not	11:28:35
25	something you know; right?	11:28:38
		I

	_	-	•
۰	•	٠.	,

		1
1	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	11:28:39
2	A. Yeah, again, I don't I didn't evaluate	11:28:41
3	all of or the other descriptions of the	11:28:49
4	companies. You know, very often, you know, just the	11:28:59
5	title is enough to know this is not gonna be it's	11:29:02
6	not going to contain any potential companies.	11:29:06
7	Q. Right. But in this case, you did not	11:29:08
8	evaluate what the member firms were for other	11:29:11
9	neighboring or, you know, internet-related	11:29:15
10	categories or segments; correct?	11:29:19
11	A. I mean, I'm somewhat familiar with some of	11:29:24
12	the other categories and things. But I didn't I	11:29:32
13	did not, for this search, go in and look at the	11:29:34
14	companies in other segments other than interactive	11:29:41
15	media services.	11:29:50
16	Q. Right. And so whether or not there are	11:29:51
17	other firms in other segments besides interactive	11:29:54
18	media and services that are more comparable to the	11:29:58
19	firms that you look at, that's not something you	11:30:00
20	have an opinion on; correct?	11:30:03
21	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	11:30:07
22	A. Again, I find it very unlikely that there	11:30:07
23	would be something that would be more comparable	11:30:10
24	that would not be in this category. You know, this	11:30:13
25	is, after all, a category that Meta is in. You	11:30:18
		1

_	$\sim$
•	u
$\boldsymbol{\circ}$	7

1	know, but, again, I didn't look at all the other	11:30:25
2	the whole the point of the screen is to narrow	11:30:29
3	down the search. So I did not look at all the	11:30:32
4	companies in some other category.	11:30:38
5	Q. Right. So I'm not asking whether you think	11:30:41
6	it's likely or unlikely. I'm asking for your	11:30:44
7	opinions that you are able to testify to under oath.	11:30:47
8	You do not have an opinion well,	11:30:51
9	actually, let me put it this way.	11:30:53
10	Whether or not there are other firms in	11:30:55
11	other segments besides interactive media and	11:30:57
12	services that are more comparable to the firms in	11:31:01
13	that segment which you looked at, that is not	11:31:04
14	something that you have analyzed and formed an	11:31:06
15	opinion on; correct?	11:31:09
16	A. Again, I didn't look at the companies in	11:31:10
17	other segments.	11:31:12
18	Q. So you can't say whether or not they are	11:31:13
19	more comparable or at least as comparable as the	11:31:16
20	firms that you did look at; right?	11:31:18
21	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	11:31:20
22	A. I can't say that there is, you know, zero	11:31:22
23	possibility that there is something that was placed	11:31:35
24	in some other category. Again, what I would expect	11:31:38
25	to find, the most comparable companies in this	11:31:43

1	category.	11:31:45
2	Q. Right. But you don't actually know because	11:31:47
3	you didn't do that analysis; isn't that correct?	11:31:50
4	A. No, I did not go and look at companies in	11:31:57
5	other categories.	11:31:59
6	Q. One of the things you said earlier was	11:31:59
7	that going back to the definition of the CapIQ	11:32:05
8	used the two statements?	11:32:08
9	A. Yeah, uh-huh.	11:32:09
10	Q. You said that if it has a primary business	11:32:10
11	in social media networking, then you would expect it	11:32:14
12	to be assigned to that industry segment.	11:32:19
13	Do you recall that?	11:32:21
14	A. Yes.	11:32:22
15	Q. Now, would you agree with me that there may	11:32:23
16	be companies that have a nonprimary business in	11:32:28
17	social media and networking that could be comparable	11:32:34
18	to Meta but that that company or those companies	11:32:38
19	might have been excluded based on this filter?	11:32:41
20	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	11:32:45
21	A. Okay. So it's there could be companies	11:32:46
22	that have a small segment of their company, not	11:32:58
23	their primary segment, that was comparable. And it	11:33:05
24	would have been put in a different category.	11:33:10
25	Q. Right.	11:33:13

1	A. But very unlikely that there was an entire	11:33:14
2	company that was comparable that would be put into a	11:33:17
3	different category.	11:33:22
4	Q. Right. We already talked about the fact	11:33:22
5	that you don't know whether or not there was an	11:33:24
6	entire company that was	11:33:26
7	A. Yeah.	11:33:27
8	Q had that as their business and was still	11:33:28
9	put into a different category; right?	11:33:31
10	A. Right. I haven't I haven't evaluated	11:33:33
11	that.	11:33:36
12	Q. Okay. So now let's talk about a company	11:33:36
13	that has a segment that is the social media and	11:33:38
14	networking segment but that that is not their	11:33:44
15	overall business. In that instance, the company	11:33:47
16	would also fall outside of your industry filter;	11:33:50
17	correct?	11:33:54
18	A. Yes.	11:33:54
19	Q. And that would be true even where that	11:33:55
20	segment might be large in absolute terms but smaller	11:33:58
21	relative to the rest of that company's business;	11:34:04
22	right?	11:34:09
23	A. Yes.	11:34:09
24	Q. And even in that circumstance where there's	11:34:10
25	a large business in social media and networking, if	11:34:15

1	companies. There's nothing nothing to lead me to	11:40:05
2	believe that I would find this information.	11:40:09
3	Q. Sir, please focus on my question.	11:40:15
4	My question is for purposes of your	11:40:17
5	assignment in this case	11:40:19
6	A. Yeah.	11:40:19
7	Q did you do anything to evaluate the	11:40:21
8	comparability of Amazon's ad business to Meta for	11:40:23
9	purposes of the yardstick analysis?	11:40:26
10	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	11:40:29
11	A. No. But, once again, I did the the six	11:40:30
12	filters. One of the filters was that it was in this	11:40:36
13	category. If it wasn't in the category, I didn't	11:40:40
14	evaluate it for this purpose.	11:40:42
15	Q. Okay. And so Amazon was not evaluated	11:40:46
16	because it didn't fit into the category; right?	11:40:49
17	A. Yes.	11:40:51
18	Q. And you didn't go you didn't go to Amazon	11:40:52
19	to look at its ads business, as opposed to the	11:40:57
20	company overall to evaluate comparability; right?	11:41:00
21	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	11:41:03
22	A. Again, I did it did not make the second	11:41:04
23	part of the filter, and I didn't go back and look at	11:41:18
24	companies that didn't make it through that filter.	11:41:23
25	Q. Okay. So the answer to my question is that	11:41:26
		I

		1
1	you did not evaluate Amazon's ads business as	11:41:29
2	opposed to Amazon overall for purposes of	11:41:36
3	comparability; correct?	11:41:39
4	A. Correct.	11:41:39
5	Q. And you didn't go look at Amazon's public	11:41:40
6	filings to determine whether there was adequate	11:41:43
7	segment information for its advertising business;	11:41:46
8	correct?	11:41:53
9	A. I didn't specifically go look at Amazon's	11:41:53
10	filings and evaluate its segment reporting on	11:41:58
11	advertising.	11:42:04
12	Q. With respect to Apple, Apple was a company	11:42:04
13	that was excluded from your comparability analysis	11:42:09
14	based on the industry segment; correct?	11:42:13
15	A. Correct.	11:42:15
16	Q. And you did not do anything to evaluate	11:42:15
17	Apple's advertising business as comparable or not	11:42:22
18	comparable to Meta for purposes of your yardstick	11:42:25
19	analysis; correct?	11:42:28
20	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	11:42:29
21	A. Once again, it didn't make it through the	11:42:30
22	second criteria of the screen, and I didn't have	11:42:34
23	a you know, a number stick where I went back and	11:42:41
24	looked at companies with, you know, small segments	11:42:46
25	that, you know, might have been comparables. It	11:42:50
		1

$\sim$	$\sim$
u	v
~	$\mathbf{a}$

1	wasn't done.	11:42:56
2	Q. Well, so first of all, do you know what	11:42:56
3	Apple's ad segment is compared to Meta's?	11:43:00
4	A. I'm generally familiar with Apple company,	11:43:07
5	and they're not their primary business is not	11:43:12
6	selling ads. It's selling other things.	11:43:19
7	Q. Right. I'm not asking about whether it's	11:43:24
8	their primary business or not.	11:43:27
9	A. Yeah.	11:43:27
10	Q. What I'm trying to understand is, did you do	11:43:29
11	anything specific in your analysis to evaluate	11:43:31
12	Apple's advertising business as opposed to hardware	11:43:35
13	and the other things it does, as comparable or not	11:43:38
14	comparable to Meta?	11:43:41
15	A. No. Once again it didn't make it through	11:43:43
16	the second criteria in the screen.	11:43:50
17	Q. And you didn't go to Apple's financials to	11:43:52
18	look for segment information on advertising;	11:43:55
19	correct?	11:44:01
20	A. Yes, correct. I think I was pretty clear	11:44:01
21	about what I did, and that wasn't in the list of	11:44:05
22	what I did.	11:44:08
23	Q. Now, you're familiar with Yahoo; right?	11:44:10
24	A. Yes.	11:44:14
25	Q. And you understand	11:44:15

		ł
1	A. Well, not anymore. I'm not even sure	11:44:17
2	they're still around, but I do remember Yahoo, yes.	11:44:20
3	Q. And they were actually acquired by Verizon.	11:44:24
4	Are you generally aware of that?	11:44:27
5	A. No, I haven't necessarily kept track of who	11:44:28
6	acquires who.	11:44:31
7	Q. Was Verizon or Yahoo in your industry	11:44:34
8	segment?	11:44:37
9	A. No.	11:44:38
10	Q. So they were filtered out at the industry	11:44:38
11	based on industry; right?	11:44:41
12	A. Yes.	11:44:43
13	Q. I guess I should say, they wouldn't have	11:44:43
14	satisfied your industry criteria; right?	11:44:46
15	A. Right.	11:44:48
16	Q. Did you do anything to evaluate the	11:44:48
17	comparability of the Yahoo Verizon ad segment to	11:44:50
18	Meta for purposes of your yardstick analysis?	11:44:55
19	A. No.	11:45:00
20	Q. Did you do anything to look at the	11:45:01
21	financials for Verizon to determine whether or not	11:45:05
22	there was sufficient segment information for the	11:45:10
23	advertising business?	11:45:13
24	A. You know, once again, if it didn't make it	11:45:17
25	through number 2 of the filter, I didn't evaluate	11:45:21
		1

1	the company or the advertising business.	11:45:26
2	Q. Right. So the answer to my question is no,	11:45:29
3	you did not look at the Verizon financials to see	11:45:31
4	whether it had a segment for advertising; right?	11:45:35
5	A. No.	11:45:38
6	Q. Is that right?	11:45:38
7	A. That's correct.	11:45:40
8	Q. Now, as I understand the industry filter,	11:45:40
9	that would filter out companies whose primary	11:45:48
10	business are online marketplaces; is that right?	11:45:51
11	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	11:45:57
12	A. You know something like an eBay, I don't	11:45:58
13	believe eBay was in that category, so yes.	11:46:09
14	Q. Now, for purposes of your Meta profitability	11:46:14
15	calculations, you didn't filter out Meta's	11:46:17
16	Marketplace revenues, did you Marketplace-based	11:46:24
17	ad revenues, did you?	11:46:25
18	A. I don't understand the question.	11:46:31
19	Q. Sure. Do you understand that Meta makes ad	11:46:34
20	revenues based on a number of different properties	11:46:37
21	within the company?	11:46:40
22	A. Yes.	11:46:42
23	Q. And are you familiar with what	11:46:43
24	Marketplace Facebook Marketplace is?	11:46:46
25	A. Yes. I'm familiar with. I'm not yeah, I	11:46:49

1	know what that is, yes.	11:46:56
2	Q. Your Meta profitability analysis did not	11:46:59
3	exclude ad revenue from Meta's Marketplace; right?	11:47:05
4	A. That is correct.	11:47:09
5	Q. Did you look at any other industry	11:47:09
6	categorizations besides CapIQ?	11:47:22
7	A. I mean, did I I mean, CapIQ is kind of	11:47:37
8	like my go-to source for this type of analysis, you	11:47:41
9	know, very large expansive database. And I	11:47:49
10	didn't I didn't go look for other databases.	11:47:54
11	Q. Did you look for any other industry	11:47:58
12	categorization of segments? So, you know, you used	11:48:03
13	CapIQ's assignment of segment.	11:48:07
14	Did you look at any other source for	11:48:09
15	identifying companies that would be in the same	11:48:11
16	segment as Meta?	11:48:14
17	A. Are you referring to like an SIC code or	11:48:19
18	something like that? No, I used the CapIQ segment	11:48:24
19	information.	11:48:35
20	Q. Are you aware that NASDAQ categorizes	11:48:35
21	companies based on industry?	11:48:43
22	A. There are a lot of different categories,	11:48:46
23	yes. I can't, as I sit here, tell you what the	11:48:52
24	NASDAQ categories are.	11:48:58
25	Q. Fair enough. But that's not something that	11:48:59

1	you'll pick anything that wasn't in the six criteria	12:18:12
2	and that wasn't part of the six criteria for	12:18:15
3	choosing the companies.	12:18:18
4	Q. Then I take it it's also fair to say that	12:18:19
5	you did not evaluate the comparability of the firms	12:18:23
6	you identified as yardsticks or the firms you	12:18:26
7	excluded as yardsticks to Meta for purposes of risk;	12:18:28
8	is that right?	12:18:35
9	A. Well, when you look at the methodology that	12:18:38
10	we used and we did the actual returns, the returns	12:18:49
11	compared to the cost of capital, now the cost to	12:18:55
12	capital is adjusted for risk. Okay? So differences	12:19:00
13	in risk of the company would be picked up in the	12:19:04
14	various costs of capital that we used.	12:19:09
15	Q. Is it your testimony that cost of capital	12:19:15
16	accounts for all of the risk to the company?	12:19:17
17	A. Well, the cost of capital accounts for the	12:19:31
18	risks that will then determine what the company has	12:19:33
19	to earn to pay for its capital.	12:19:42
20	Q. Other than evaluating the cost of capital,	12:19:45
21	did you do anything to consider the comparability of	12:19:49
22	Meta to the yardstick firms or the firms you	12:19:53
23	excluded as yardsticks when it comes to risk?	12:19:56
24	A. Okay. So again, in that context, risk	12:20:02
25	really refers to what's going to happen in the	12:20:07
		1

1	future. All these things have already happened with	12:20:11
2	these companies. I wasn't comparing prices and	12:20:17
3	expectations of the companies. So there's so	12:20:22
4	there was no evaluation of how risk would have	12:20:29
5	affected the prices because that wasn't wasn't	12:20:32
6	part of the calculations.	12:20:36
7	Q. Right. Right. And you also didn't look at	12:20:39
8	historical risk during the four-year period that you	12:20:43
9	considered for purposes of comparability; isn't that	12:20:46
10	right?	12:20:50
11	A. No. Again, I was looking at things that	12:20:50
12	have already happened. They were you can say	12:20:56
13	they were without risk because we knew what	12:21:01
14	happened. There was no no range of possibilities	12:21:03
15	around what actually happened. This already	12:21:07
16	happened.	12:21:10
17	Q. Did you do anything to analyze the	12:21:10
18	comparability of Meta to the yardstick firms or	12:21:13
19	firms you excluded as yardsticks based on cash-flow	12:21:16
20	profiles?	12:21:20
21	A. Specifically cash-flow profiles, no.	12:21:34
22	Q. You employed a revenue filter in your	12:21:38
23	analysis?	12:21:42
24	A. Yes.	12:21:44
25	Q. And as I understand it, you pick a one	12:21:45

1	1	1
-1	Z	1

1	one-thousandth cutoff one of a one-thousandth	12:21:51
2	cutoff for revenue; is that right?	12:21:51
3	A. Yes.	12:21:53
4	Q. Where did you come up with that number?	12:21:54
5	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	12:21:57
6	A. Okay. Well, the revenue filter was to limit	12:22:00
7	size. One one-thousandth is a very, very, very	12:22:12
8	liberal cutoff in terms of size. The idea here was	12:22:18
9	we wanted to cast a very, very wide net to pick up,	12:22:22
10	you know, the most the highest possible number.	12:22:26
11	Q. Was there some analysis that you did to	12:22:30
12	arrive at one one-thousandth?	12:22:35
13	A. No. Again, that was the it was a number	12:22:39
14	that was very very inclusive as a screen. You	12:22:44
15	have to draw the line somewhere, and we drew it very	12:22:52
16	far away.	12:22:55
17	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Counsel, in about five	12:22:59
18	minutes, I'll need to take a break to switch disks.	12:23:03
19	MS. MEHTA: Okay. Great. We'll wrap up	12:23:06
20	this line of questioning in less than five minutes.	12:23:08
21	BY MS. MEHTA:	12:23:10
22	Q. When you're narrowing the firms to identify	12:23:13
23	the pool of comparable firms, was it your goal to	12:23:17
24	cast a wide net?	12:23:23
25	A. Yes.	12:23:32

1	Q. And would you agree with me that in casting	12:23:33
2	a wide net, you will actually end up including	12:23:43
3	noncomparable firms in your analysis?	12:23:46
4	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	12:23:47
5	A. Well, I think that you say "noncomparable,"	12:24:01
6	we certainly you know, the narrower the criteria,	12:24:10
7	the tighter it's gonna be to the company. But I	12:24:17
8	don't think that you can say noncomparable. I'm not	12:24:24
9	quite sure what how to interpret that.	12:24:33
10	Q. Well, let's get back to the revenue filter	12:24:37
11	for a second.	12:24:40
12	With respect to revenue filter, you said you	12:24:41
13	wanted to cast a very wide net; right?	12:24:45
14	A. Yes.	12:24:47
15	Q. Now, it was also important, though, to get	12:24:48
16	to companies that were comparable to Meta in terms	12:24:51
17	of revenue; right?	12:24:54
18	A. Yes. As much as possible, yeah.	12:24:56
19	Q. Okay. And you believe that a company that	12:25:01
20	has one one-thousandth of the revenue of Meta would	12:25:04
21	be comparable to Meta from revenue for revenue	12:25:07
22	purposes?	12:25:11
23	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	12:25:11
24	A. Well, I believe that something outside that	12:25:15
25	is something we don't need to look at as being	12:25:26

1	$^{\circ}$	7
ı	/	. /

1	record. The time is 12:41 p.m.	12:41:19
2	BY MS. MEHTA:	12:41:21
3	Q. Mr. Kreitzman, welcome back. Before the	12:41:24
4	break, we were talking about your revenue filter.	12:41:27
5	Do you recall that?	12:41:30
6	A. Yes.	12:41:30
7	Q. As I understand the application of your	12:41:31
8	revenue filter, if a firm passed the other five	12:41:33
9	criteria, it would still qualify as a comparable	12:41:40
10	firm or yardstick firm to Meta if it had one	12:41:44
11	one-thousandth of Meta's revenue; is that right?	12:41:50
12	A. Yes. It was a was there a statement	12:42:01
13	missing?	12:42:18
14	Q. Your answer cut off so we didn't we heard	12:42:20
15	"yes, it was a," and then I didn't hear anything	12:42:23
16	else. I don't think the court reporter did either.	12:42:27
17	MS. LAWRENCE: I did not either.	12:42:29
18	A. Okay. So what let me move closer to my	12:42:30
19	computer a little bit. Okay. So what I'm sorry.	12:42:33
20	What was the question again, just to make sure	12:42:37
21	I'm	12:42:39
22	Q. Yes. If a firm passed the other five	12:42:39
23	criteria, it would still qualify as a comparable	12:42:43
24	firm or a yardstick firm, for purposes of your	12:42:45
25	analysis, if it had one one-thousandth of Meta's	12:42:48

1	revenue; is that correct?	12:42:52
2	A. Yes, that would have not that alone would	12:42:55
3	not have taken it out of contention as a possible	12:42:58
4	yardstick firm.	12:43:03
5	Q. If you had selected a different revenue	12:43:04
6	cutoff, say, one eight-hundredth, one of your	12:43:09
7	comparable firms would have fallen out, the	12:43:17
8	Wirtualna Polska firm; correct?	12:43:24
9	A. That sounds about right, yes.	12:43:25
10	Q. And, certainly, if you had picked one	12:43:27
11	five-hundredth, it would have fallen out; right?	12:43:31
12	A. Yes. Because that's okay.	12:43:33
13	Q. Did you do anything to evaluate what the	12:43:38
14	economic profit analysis would have been, or your	12:43:47
15	EPR analysis would have been if you had selected a	12:43:50
16	revenue filter that was more fine-grained than one	12:43:54
17	one-thousandth?	12:44:01
18	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	12:44:01
19	A. Are you asking did I do a some sort of	12:44:11
20	sensitivity analysis on the revenue filter?	12:44:14
21	Q. Not exactly. Well, maybe. Maybe that's how	12:44:18
22	you would put it. What I'm getting at and then	12:44:23
23	you can tell me if this makes sense to you or not	12:44:26
24	is whether you know what the result of your economic	12:44:30
25	profit analysis would have been if you had employed	12:44:33

1	a different revenue filter, one that had the	12:44:38
2	comparable firm's revenue closer to Meta's than one	12:44:43
3	one-thousandth?	12:44:54
4	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	12:44:54
5	A. Well, I think that certainly the tighter the	12:44:54
6	requirements, the smaller number of companies that	12:45:03
7	would have fallen through the filter. Did I	12:45:05
8	specifically look at different numbers and see what	12:45:09
9	would have been no, I did not do that analysis.	12:45:15
10	Q. Market cap is another one of your six	12:45:19
11	selection criteria; correct?	12:45:26
12	A. Yes.	12:45:30
13	Q. And you also picked a one one-thousandth	12:45:31
14	cutoff for market cap; correct?	12:45:33
15	A. Yes.	12:45:35
16	Q. And was your goal in doing that, was it also	12:45:35
17	to cast a very wide net with respect to that	12:45:38
18	criteria, that selection criteria?	12:45:41
19	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	12:45:43
20	A. Yes. And that was another minimum-sized	12:45:45
21	criteria.	12:45:52
22	Q. Right. And according to your criteria, if a	12:45:53
23	firm passed the other five criteria, you would still	12:45:58
24	consider it comparable or a yardstick firm if it had	12:46:01
25	one one-thousandth of Meta's market cap; is that	12:46:05
		I

1	right?	12:46:09
2	A. It would still be a potential market a	12:46:09
3	potential yardstick firm with that, yes.	12:46:14
4	Q. Right. And so if all of the other five	12:46:17
5	criteria were met, then it would be a yardstick firm	12:46:20
6	even if it had one one-thousandth of Meta's market	12:46:23
7	cap; correct?	12:46:26
8	A. Well, ultimately, what was in the yardstick	12:46:31
9	had met the criteria of the would have been	12:46:37
10	Michael Williams's call on this. Okay. So this was	12:46:41
11	a screen. This would have been a potential	12:46:47
12	yardstick company if it met if it met the six	12:46:52
13	criteria, it came through as a potential yardstick	12:46:56
14	company.	12:46:59
15	Q. The numerical cutoff for one one-thousandth	12:46:59
16	and market cap was 534.69 million; right?	12:47:15
17	A. Again, I'll take your word for it. I didn't	12:47:20
18	memorize all these numbers.	12:47:24
19	Q. The market cap for Wirtualna Polska was	12:47:27
20	542.9 million; correct?	12:47:34
21	A. Again, I didn't memorize these, but I'll	12:47:38
22	take your word for that as well.	12:47:42
23	Q. That's on page 12 of your report, if you	12:47:44
24	want to verify that.	12:47:46
25	A. Okay. I'm sorry. That's the reply	12:47:48

1	Q. No, I'm sorry. Page 18 of your report,	12:48:01
2	not 12.	12:48:07
3	A. Yeah.	12:48:07
4	Q. Are you there?	12:48:17
5	A. 542, yes.	12:48:18
6	Q. Right. And if you go to page 17, you'll see	12:48:19
7	the cutoff. It's 534 million; right?	12:48:22
8	A. Yes.	12:48:26
9	Q. So if your cutoff for market cap had been	12:48:27
10	almost anything other than one one-thousandth,	12:48:35
11	Wirtualna Polska would have fallen out of your	12:48:38
12	yardstick analysis; isn't that right?	12:48:45
13	A. It would have been screened out, yes, had it	12:48:48
14	been a different cutoff.	12:48:50
15	Q. Right. Even if it had been one	12:48:52
16	nine-hundredth or one eight-hundredth, it would have	12:48:57
17	been screened out; correct?	12:49:00
18	A. I didn't do that calculation, but it doesn't	12:49:05
19	sound at all off the wall so	12:49:08
20	Q. Let's look at your calculation for Meta's	12:49:27
21	market capitalization.	12:49:35
22	As I understand your report, you estimated	12:49:38
23	Meta's ads average market cap to be 80 percent of	12:49:41
24	Meta's average market capitalization; is that right?	12:49:47
25	A. What you're referring to what?	12:49:55

1	32	4	

1	Q. Footnote 43 in your reply report.	12:49:59
2	A. 43.	12:50:03
3	Yes.	12:50:30
4	Q. So as I understood your calculation, you	12:50:30
5	calculated the average market capitalization for	12:50:34
6	Meta's ads business to be 80 percent of Meta's	12:50:43
7	average market capitalization; is that right?	12:50:47
8	A. I used that as a rough estimate.	12:50:50
9	Q. Where did you come up with the 80 percent	12:50:53
10	rough estimate?	12:50:55
11	A. Again, I was looking at just doing a wide	12:50:56
12	net and being as inclusive as possible, so I just	12:51:06
13	looked at this as kind of the outside range that I	12:51:14
14	seriously doubted it could have been less than	12:51:19
15	80 percent.	12:51:22
16	Q. Right. So you were trying to go for a wider	12:51:23
17	net as opposed to a narrower net; is that right?	12:51:26
18	A. Yep. Yes.	12:51:29
19	Q. In fact, Meta's market capitalization for	12:51:30
20	its ads business could have been substantially	12:51:36
21	higher than 80 percent; is that right?	12:51:39
22	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	12:51:42
23	A. Yeah. So 80 percent was not done on a by	12:51:43
24	basis of a calculation. It would have required a	12:51:49
25	separate valuation of the Meta ads from the rest of	12:51:54

1	2	1
1	J	4

1	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	12:53:40
2	A. I believe that is that that sounds about	12:53:49
3	right. Again, I don't have all these numbers	12:53:53
4	memorized.	12:53:58
5	Q. So notwithstanding the fact that Meta's ads	12:53:59
6	business makes up 98 percent made up 98 percent	12:54:02
7	of its total revenue in 2020, your screening	12:54:05
8	criteria was based off an 80 percent rough estimate	12:54:12
9	of ads market capitalization; correct?	12:54:15
10	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	12:54:19
11	A. These were two very different things. The	12:54:23
12	whole Metaverse investment was, you know, in that	12:54:31
13	time period not making money but still had a	12:54:40
14	substantial amount of company's resources were put	12:54:46
15	into it. So it had value that either would expect	12:54:48
16	it to exceed its revenue percentage, or it was a	12:54:55
17	complete waste of money.	12:54:59
18	So there's this was something that was	12:55:00
19	being a lot of money being poured into this area,	12:55:02
20	but it was not yet generating revenue. So the	12:55:11
21	you know, the value of whatever this business would	12:55:14
22	be and what the implications were would not be very	12:55:18
23	correlated to the revenue.	12:55:22
24	Q. So we'll talk about the Reality Labs	12:55:24
25	business in just a moment. I want to be very clear.	12:55:28
		1

1	2	~
1	Э	J

1	Your calculation of the percent of Meta's	12:55:31
2	market cap that's attributable to Meta's ads	12:55:34
3	business is not based on any data from Meta's	12:55:37
4	financial reporting; correct?	12:55:40
5	A. When you say "not based on," I didn't	12:55:49
6	totally pull it out of the air, but I was just	12:55:51
7	looking at the at the numbers. And that was my	12:55:53
8	estimate for what should be used in the screen.	12:55:57
9	Q. Right. But you didn't do any calculation,	12:56:02
10	based on Meta's financial data, in order to	12:56:05
11	determine that the market cap for the ads business	12:56:08
12	was 80 percent of total market cap; isn't that	12:56:10
13	right?	12:56:14
14	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	12:56:15
15	A. The 80 percent was a judgment-based	12:56:15
16	assumption. It was not the basis of any thorough	12:56:21
17	analysis of the value of these two businesses.	12:56:26
18	Q. Okay. Now, let's talk about your adjustment	12:56:30
19	for the Reality Labs, the virtual reality business.	12:56:35
20	A. Yeah.	12:56:39
21	Q. So as I understand it, if you had not	12:56:40
22	adjusted for the Reality Labs business, in other	12:56:45
23	words if you had not adjusted Meta's market cap to	12:56:48
24	exclude that, the market capitalization would have	12:56:52
25	been even higher; correct?	12:56:54

1	A. So is 80 percent less than a hundred	12:57:05
2	percent? I'm taking that's what your question is.	12:57:14
3	Yes.	12:57:18
4	Q. No. Well, no. I mean my question is	12:57:18
5	actually it's a serious question so, you know,	12:57:20
6	let's take it seriously.	12:57:24
7	If you had not done whatever your estimating	12:57:25
8	was to exclude the Reality Labs from your	12:57:30
9	assessment, the market capitalization for the ads	12:57:36
10	business would have been higher than 80 percent;	12:57:39
11	correct?	12:57:44
12	A. Well, that would have been the market	12:57:44
13	capitalization for all of Meta.	12:57:46
14	Q. And your estimate of the 20 percent was,	12:57:50
15	again, that you attributed to Reality Labs was based	12:57:56
16	on a, as you put it, judgment-based assumption;	12:58:00
17	correct?	12:58:16
18	A. Yes.	12:58:16
19	Q. Not based on a calculation reflective of	12:58:16
20	Meta's financial data; correct?	12:58:22
21	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	12:58:24
22	A. Well, it was an assumption it was a	12:58:27
23	judgment and an assumption I made after looking at	12:58:29
24	Meta's data. Again, to this evaluation, this	12:58:33
25	would have been a very complex calculation splitting	12:58:41
		1

1	of the class period; correct?	13:29:24
2	A. Correct.	13:29:26
3	Q. Now, let's focus on this particular	13:29:27
4	criteria.	13:29:31
5	For this particular criteria, positive	13:29:31
6	annual income, you thought it was important that the	13:29:33
7	firm be comparable to Meta across the class period	13:29:36
8	and not just at the end of the class period;	13:29:39
9	correct?	13:29:42
10	A. Yes.	13:29:42
11	Q. And that is why you screened across all of	13:29:43
12	the years of the class period and not just 2020;	13:29:47
13	correct?	13:29:51
14	A. Correct.	13:29:51
15	Q. And you don't know what the analysis would	13:29:52
16	have looked like if you had screened for positive	13:29:56
17	annual income in only 2020; right?	13:29:59
18	A. No, I didn't I didn't run that number.	13:30:06
19	Q. So you don't know whether there were	13:30:12
20	companies that maybe started out in 2016 and didn't	13:30:14
21	have a positive annual income but by 2020, did have	13:30:17
22	a positive annual income and were comparable to	13:30:22
23	Meta. That's not an analysis you did; correct?	13:30:25
24	A. No. If they were screened out, I didn't go	13:30:29
25	back and look at them.	13:30:33
		I

1	Q. Right. So you have no idea whether or not	13:30:34
2	by requiring a positive annual income for each of	13:30:38
3	the years of the class period, you excluded firms	13:30:41
4	that were comparable by 2020; right?	13:30:47
5	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	13:30:49
6	A. Okay. If it was comparable only in 2020, I	13:30:53
7	wouldn't have included it because I was looking at	13:31:03
8	it for a longer time period than just 2020.	13:31:05
9	Q. Now, and the same would be true for 2019 or	13:31:09
10	2018; right?	13:31:13
11	A. Yes.	13:31:15
12	Q. Now, you would agree with me that companies	13:31:16
13	can have negative income before delivering very	13:31:23
14	significant profits; right?	13:31:28
15	A. Yes.	13:31:34
16	Q. Did you do anything to evaluate which firms	13:31:35
17	would have passed your filter for annual positive	13:32:02
18	positive annual income if you had used a period of	13:32:11
19	2017 to 2020, for example?	13:32:17
20	A. No. I did the we ran the screens. I	13:32:21
21	didn't go in and look for all the other permutations	13:32:30
22	of changing the parameters of the screen.	13:32:35
23	Q. You used full-year-2016 to full-year-2020	13:32:37
24	information; right?	13:32:45
25	A. Yes.	13:32:48

1	Q. And do you have an understanding that the	13:32:48
2	class period begins on December 1, 2016?	13:32:52
3	A. Yes.	13:32:56
4	Q. You didn't do anything to evaluate what the	13:32:57
5	results of your yardstick analysis would have been	13:33:04
6	if you had started on December 1, 2016, as opposed	13:33:07
7	to January 1, 2016; correct?	13:33:10
8	A. No. Again, when you run these screens and	13:33:18
9	things, you need to be you need to design them in	13:33:21
10	such a way that you have objective data that you can	13:33:27
11	run. Companies don't say, here's what we did in	13:33:32
12	December and put that in their reports.	13:33:37
13	Q. Right. So the answer to my question is, you	13:33:39
14	didn't do anything to evaluate what the results of	13:33:42
15	the analysis would have been if you had started on	13:33:46
16	December 1, 2016, instead of January 1, 2016;	13:33:48
17	correct?	13:33:50
18	A. Correct.	13:33:50
19	Q. And you also didn't do anything to evaluate	13:33:51
20	what the results of your yardstick analysis would	13:33:54
21	have been if you had started on December 1, 2017, as	13:33:57
22	opposed to January 1, 2016; correct?	13:34:01
23	A. Can we get the numbers again, the dates?	13:34:04
24	Q. Yes. You also did do not anything to	13:34:10
25	evaluate what the results of your yardstick analysis	13:34:13

-		
		٠,
	. /	_

1	comparable in absolute dollars to Meta's ads	13:56:59
2	business, it would have failed filter 6 if the ads	13:57:02
3	business was not more than 80 percent of the firm's	13:57:08
4	overall revenue; is that correct?	13:57:10
5	A. Yes. If it was less than 80 percent, it	13:57:11
6	would have failed the test. So any characteristics	13:57:15
7	of anything less than 80 percent would have failed.	13:57:18
8	That was the criteria.	13:57:22
9	Q. Okay. Now let's talk for a moment about why	13:57:23
10	you say you employed this 80-percent filter.	13:57:26
11	As I understand it, you said you needed the	13:57:29
12	80-percent filter because you needed to ensure that	13:57:32
13	you had data for your calculations; is that right?	13:57:35
14	A. Yes.	13:57:39
15	Q. So the purpose of the 80-percent filter was	13:57:40
16	ensuring that you had data, not evaluating	13:57:45
17	comparability to Meta at a substantive level;	13:57:50
18	correct?	13:57:54
19	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	13:57:54
20	A. Okay. I'm not quite sure what you're asking	13:58:00
21	here again. You have so I think the point was to	13:58:07
22	have if a company was had a statement of its	13:58:10
23	business, but it was only a smart part of it, then	13:58:19
24	its consolidated financial statement would not be a	13:58:22
25	good reflection of that business.	13:58:25
		1

4 /	70
- 1	14
1	,,

1	Q. Right.	13:58:30
2	A. Generally, my experience looking at	13:58:30
3	thousands and thousands of annual reports is that	13:58:33
4	segment reporting typically would not give you	13:58:36
5	enough information to break out that segment and do	13:58:42
6	a detailed information do a detail search without	13:58:48
7	information from the company regarding that segment.	13:58:53
8	Q. Okay. So that's that's what I'm getting	13:59:00
9	at.	13:59:03
10	So the purpose of the criteria number 6 was	13:59:04
11	to ensure that you had you were screening for	13:59:07
12	firms so you would have adequate data available to	13:59:13
13	you; correct?	13:59:17
14	A. Yes.	13:59:17
15	Q. Okay. It's but it's also fair that if a	13:59:18
16	company met all five of your other criteria, it	13:59:23
17	would not necessarily be less comparable just	13:59:27
18	because it had less than 80 percent of its overall	13:59:32
19	revenue attributable to ads; right?	13:59:38
20	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	13:59:44
21	A. Yeah. Again, I'm not going to say less	13:59:46
22	comparable. It would be would the consolidated	13:59:50
23	financial statements be less comparable if it had	13:59:57
24	if 50 percent of its business was ads, the	14:00:05
25	consolidated financial statements would not give a	14:00:09

1	very good picture of what that company is. It would	14:00:17
2	not have included into a yardstick. It would just	14:00:22
3	have been too muddy. It's too far away.	14:00:25
4	Q. Okay. But from so set aside the	14:00:30
5	consolidated financial statements for a second.	14:00:33
6	In terms of the actual comparability of the	14:00:35
7	ads business of that firm, a firm that passed the	14:00:37
8	other five criteria but had 80 percent less than	14:00:40
9	80 percent of its overall revenues from ads, the	14:00:42
10	actual comparability of its ads business isn't	14:00:46
11	affected by what portion of the firm's overall	14:00:50
12	revenues ads constitutes; correct?	14:00:53
13	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form. Object to	14:00:56
14	form.	14:00:57
15	A. Yeah, so it may have something which is a	14:00:58
16	small segment of its business, but it's very much	14:01:05
17	like Meta's business.	14:01:09
18	Q. Right.	14:01:12
19	A. So that is possible, but that is, again,	14:01:13
20	just practically being able to do the calculations	14:01:17
21	to find out the the correct values of the	14:01:22
22	yardstick index, that would not that would not	14:01:27
23	work.	14:01:29
24	Q. Right. So set aside ability to do the	14:01:29
25	calculations. Your criteria number 6 as you applied	14:01:32
		I

	_		_
-	•	,	•
			7

1	it might exclude as a yardstick firm a firm that met	14:01:38
2	all five of the other criteria and a firm whose ads	14:01:45
3	business was comparable to Meta's ads business, but	14:01:49
4	it was excluded because it did not have 80 percent	14:01:56
5	of its overall revenue from ads; correct?	14:02:00
6	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	14:02:02
7	A. Again, the ads business could have been	14:02:03
8	similar and had that been a stand-alone company, it	14:02:06
9	would have been a good comp. So, you know, that is,	14:02:10
10	you know, possible in an ideal world, you'd get all	14:02:19
11	the data and be able to use these things. But	14:02:22
12	Q. And because you haven't done that analysis,	14:02:30
13	you don't know whether or not there were firms that	14:02:33
14	were that had ads businesses that were at least	14:02:37
15	or potentially more comparable to Meta's ads	14:02:41
16	business than your yardstick firms that were	14:02:44
17	screened out based on criteria number 6; correct?	14:02:47
18	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	14:02:51
19	A. Yeah, again, I didn't I didn't evaluate	14:02:54
20	these segments that were less than 80 percent of	14:02:57
21	these companies. So I can't answer that.	14:03:00
22	Q. Right.	14:03:02
23	A. But I don't have any valuation. I don't	14:03:03
24	have an opinion of whether they were comparable or	14:03:06
25	not comparable.	14:03:08
		I

1	Q. Right. So it's possible that there were	14:03:09
2	firms that had ads businesses that were at least, if	14:03:14
3	not more comparable than your yardstick firms that	14:03:17
4	were screened out as a result of criteria number 6;	14:03:21
5	right?	14:03:24
6	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	14:03:24
7	A. Yeah. Again, it could've it's possible	14:03:28
8	that this segment by itself would have been a	14:03:30
9	comparable and comparable to Meta's business.	14:03:39
10	Q. And that's not something that you evaluated	14:03:41
11	as part of your analysis; correct?	14:03:45
12	A. That's correct.	14:03:46
13	Q. Now, could we talk for a moment about how it	14:03:47
14	is that you determined what portion of revenues were	14:04:04
15	attributable to ads in application of your	14:04:10
16	80-percent cutoff?	14:04:16
17	So for the at least some of the firms you	14:04:18
18	analyzed, you had to figure out what segments should	14:04:21
19	be counted as advertising revenue and not; correct?	14:04:24
20	A. Yes. That would entail, you know, looking	14:04:27
21	at the annual reports. Sometimes, you know	14:04:31
22	(audio distortion) what their business was and	14:04:41
23	whether it would be something that would work.	14:04:42
24	Q. Did you and I assume then for purposes of	14:04:44
25	criteria number 6, that a segment that derived	14:04:47

	_		-
		"	,
			•

1	revenue from advertising should have been included	14:04:51
2	in your calculation; right?	14:04:55
3	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	14:05:00
4	A. Again, I'm not quite sure	14:05:07
5	Q. I think I can let me try to be more	14:05:09
6	precise.	14:05:12
7	If you found a segment that was where all	14:05:12
8	of its revenue was attributable to advertising, you	14:05:16
9	would have included that in your your	14:05:19
10	calculations?	14:05:21
11	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	14:05:24
12	A. Okay. You were cutting out a little bit. I	14:05:28
13	think you're gone.	14:05:32
14	MS. LAWRENCE: Sonal, you're gone. You're	14:05:33
15	frozen. You're back?	14:05:36
16	MS. MEHTA: I'm here.	14:05:37
17	MS. LAWRENCE: You froze.	14:05:39
18	MS. MEHTA: Let me try again.	14:05:40
19	MS. LAWRENCE: You might want to repeat the	14:05:42
20	question.	14:05:43
21	MS. MEHTA: Yeah, let me try it again.	14:05:43
22	BY MS. MEHTA:	14:05:45
23	Q. If you found a segment where all of the	14:05:46
24	revenue was attributable to advertising, you would	14:05:48
25	have counted that towards your 80 percent; right?	14:05:53

		i
1	A. Correct.	15:04:50
2	Q. Okay. And your judgment was that even	15:04:51
3	though leads generation services enable Autohome's	15:04:55
4	customers to place advertisements that you made the	15:05:01
5	judgment that that was not advertising-related	15:05:03
6	revenue; is that right?	15:05:05
7	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	15:05:07
8	A. Based on this from the judgment was that	15:05:09
9	leads generation services was not a good measure of	15:05:24
10	advertising revenue or media services was targeted	15:05:28
11	so they were actually selling targeted ads.	15:05:32
12	Leads generation services sounded very much	15:05:35
13	like it was a service to the dealers that allowed	15:05:38
14	them to do certain things. So basically creating	15:05:48
15	giving them access to software. It wasn't it was	15:05:54
16	not very clear that this was you know, there	15:05:59
17	might have been the word advertisements in the	15:06:04
18	description, did not judge this to be advertising	15:06:07
19	revenue.	15:06:11
20	Q. Did you do anything specifically to	15:06:13
21	investigate what advertisements were enabled through	15:06:16
22	the leads generation category before you excluded it	15:06:20
23	from the advertising revenue category advertising	15:06:25
24	revenues you calculated?	15:06:25
25	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	15:06:31
		i

		i
1	A. Again, the description of the leads	15:06:43
2	generation services did not judge that to be	15:06:44
3	advertising revenue that was relevant for our	15:06:51
4	purposes. The fact that they said that allowed	15:06:56
5	dealers to place advertisements in their lead	15:07:03
6	generation services doesn't make this whole thing	15:07:06
7	advertising.	15:07:10
8	Q. Do you know specifically how Autohome's lead	15:07:11
9	generation services enabled advertisers to place	15:07:15
10	advertisements?	15:07:19
11	A. No, but again, this looks like it was a	15:07:31
12	you know, a bulletin board. This was very	15:07:34
13	different, very different from targeted ads.	15:07:41
14	Q. That wasn't my question, sir.	15:07:45
15	My question was: Do you know specifically	15:07:46
16	how Autohome and its lead generation business	15:07:48
17	segment enables its customers to place ads?	15:07:53
18	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	15:07:56
19	A. No. I did not I did not go in depth into	15:08:00
20	the business of Autohome's lead generation services.	15:08:06
21	Q. Do you know how Autohome realizes or	15:08:12
22	recognizes revenue from the placement of	15:08:17
23	advertisements in its lead generation business	15:08:20
24	segment?	15:08:23
25	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	15:08:24
		i

		i
1	A. Nope. Again, I did not once once	15:08:42
2	something was deemed not to be in the run, I didn't	15:08:45
3	continue to do analysis of those companies.	15:08:48
4	Q. Right. But I'm not I'm not asking about	15:08:50
5	whether or not you did an analysis after you	15:08:52
6	excluded it. We're talking about your application	15:08:54
7	of criteria number 6. So this is whether or not it	15:08:56
8	should be included or not. And you did an analysis	15:08:59
9	for criteria number 6 for Autohome, and I'm trying	15:09:01
10	to understand what you included in the revenue base	15:09:04
11	and what you did not include in the revenue base	15:09:08
12	when you applied criteria number 6.	15:09:12
13	So with respect to Autohome and the lead	15:09:14
14	generation part of its business, do you know how	15:09:16
15	advertisement revenue is reflected in that lead	15:09:22
16	generation business segment?	15:09:25
17	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	15:09:28
18	A. No, I don't. I looked at an awful lot of	15:09:38
19	quotes and financial information and other things,	15:09:42
20	but I do not recall exactly what Autohome did for	15:09:44
21	their tracking of advertising revenues related to	15:09:51
22	lead generation services.	15:09:58
23	Q. Right. And I take it then that you did not	15:09:59
24	calculate what the advertising revenue associated	15:10:02
25	with the lead generation business segment for	15:10:05
		ı

1	do you?	15:11:44
2	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	15:11:44
3	A. Well, I can I can read the description,	15:12:03
4	and there are a lot of things here that are not	15:12:06
5	advertising. There's also the things that might be	15:12:08
6	included as advertising like, you know, listing on a	15:12:16
7	bulletin board, which I would not consider to be	15:12:21
8	comparable to the targeted ads that we were trying	15:12:25
9	to find.	15:12:27
10	Q. Right. That's not my question, sir.	15:12:29
11	My question is: You don't actually know	15:12:32
12	what portion of the leads generation business	15:12:37
13	segment for Autohome is attributable to advertising	15:12:41
14	revenue	15:12:46
15	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	15:12:47
16	Q correct?	15:12:48
17	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	15:12:49
18	A. Again, I did I did not I looked at the	15:12:56
19	lead at the description and did not determine	15:13:01
20	that this represented advertising revenue. Media	15:13:04
21	services did. It said targeted marketing solutions.	15:13:11
22	Okay. So this is targeting ads. This makes sense.	15:13:14
23	Lead generation, this was business relationship	15:13:19
24	software-generated-sales leads, enable this contact	15:13:26
25	between the dealers and potential buyers, manage	15:13:38

1	customer relationships. These are these are all	15:13:47
2	things that are not targeted ads.	15:13:49
3	Q. Did you consult with any expert in the	15:13:54
4	advertising industry before you made a judgment as	15:13:58
5	to what aspects of any of the firm's business should	15:14:01
6	be should be counted towards advertising revenue	15:14:07
7	or not?	15:14:09
8	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	15:14:10
9	A. Again, so I read these things and made a	15:14:14
10	judgment as to whether or not this was something	15:14:18
11	that should be counted in our advertising.	15:14:27
12	Q. Right. My question was: In making that	15:14:30
13	judgment, did you consult with anyone that has	15:14:32
14	expertise in the advertising industry?	15:14:35
15	A. No.	15:14:40
16	Q. Or did you make that judgment yourself?	15:14:40
17	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	15:14:44
18	A. Yeah, I made that judgment based on the	15:14:46
19	description in the 20-F.	15:14:48
20	Q. Okay. Now, with respect to Autohome and the	15:14:50
21	lead generation segment of their business, do you	15:14:58
22	know whether Meta is involved in lead generation in	15:15:03
23	its advertising business?	15:15:06
24	A. Well, when you say "lead generation," would	15:15:24
25	some of the ads go towards someone trying to	15:15:32

1	generate leads? I think this is a a different	15:15:35
2	issue. This is selling cars. You know how the car	15:15:51
3	business works. You know, automating generating	15:15:54
4	sales leads. Okay. That's basically someone to	15:16:01
5	call and contact.	15:16:03
6	Q. Well, sir, it says "place advertisements."	15:16:06
7	That's one of the things that you can do through	15:16:10
8	Autohome's lead generation	15:16:15
9	A. Yeah.	15:16:15
10	Q business services; right?	15:16:17
11	A. Yeah.	15:16:18
12	Q. And you don't know specifically how they	15:16:18
13	place ads in that business segment; correct?	15:16:21
14	A. Well, I've seen ads for car things. They	15:16:29
15	have a picture of the car and where to buy it and	15:16:33
16	the price they're asking.	15:16:37
17	Q. You understand that people place ads on	15:16:44
18	Facebook that do the same things; right?	15:16:46
19	A. Facebook	15:16:46
20	MS. LAWRENCE: Object	15:16:46
21	(Indiscernible crosstalk.)	15:16:50
22	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	15:16:50
23	A. You know, there's the Facebook Marketplace.	15:16:52
24	I think we discussed that earlier.	15:16:59
25	Q. Or a car dealer can place an ad on Facebook;	15:17:01
		1

	2	1
_	z	

1	advertising; isn't that right?	15:56:46
2	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	15:56:49
3	A. Yes, this is based on based on Bloomberg,	15:56:54
4	although, one side was rounded on my exhibit and one	15:57:01
5	wasn't, for some reason. It comes out to	15:57:06
6	100 percent.	15:57:09
7	Q. Okay. Now, when you came up with	15:57:09
8	100 percent, you did not calculate what portion of	15:57:12
9	Wirtualna Polska's revenue came from agency sales of	15:57:17
10	tourist services; correct?	15:57:23
11	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	15:57:25
12	A. Okay. So the hundred percent came from	15:57:33
13	Bloomberg. And did I I didn't I made no	15:57:37
14	adjustment to the hundred percent based on these	15:57:42
15	other categories.	15:57:50
16	Q. Okay. So and when you say "other	15:57:51
17	categories," you mean you made no adjustment for	15:57:54
18	revenues from that hundred percent that might	15:57:57
19	actually be attributable to agency sales of tourist	15:57:59
20	services; correct?	15:58:03
21	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	15:58:03
22	A. Yeah, I did not adjust anything for tourist	15:58:09
23	services, and I don't know that these were I	15:58:21
24	mean, the financials may have only had one source.	15:58:31
25	I'd have to really look. I don't remember details	15:58:34

1	of all these companies.	15:58:37
2	Q. I want you to sir, I understand that you	15:58:38
3	might be startled to learn this new information but	15:58:41
4	I need you to focus on my question, please.	15:58:44
5	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	15:58:47
6	Q. Please focus on my question. Your	15:58:48
7	calculation of Wirtualna Polska's advertising	15:58:52
8	revenue did not factor in revenues that would be	15:58:54
9	attributable to agency sales for tourist services as	15:58:58
10	opposed to advertising; isn't that right?	15:59:02
11	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	15:59:04
12	A. Okay. So I did not do any calculations that	15:59:08
13	included subtracting agency sales for tourist	15:59:16
14	services. And, again, I would need to look at the	15:59:20
15	reported financial statements and see what	15:59:26
16	information was provided. There's no information	15:59:31
17	here as to, you know, what type of percentage of	15:59:36
18	revenue or dollar amount of revenue, I guess, Euro	15:59:44
19	value of revenue would have been attributable to	15:59:50
20	these various groups.	15:59:53
21	Q. Right. You also didn't subtract out revenue	15:59:54
22	for the sale of architectural designs online; right?	15:59:56
23	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	16:00:01
24	A. Again, I don't recall seeing this. I don't	16:00:03
25	recall seeing any line items that gave any values	16:00:09

1	for architectural designs.	16:00:12
2	Q. So you didn't subtract that out from the	16:00:16
3	revenues; right?	16:00:18
4	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	16:00:19
5	A. Again, I don't recall ever seeing a line	16:00:22
6	item for revenue for architectural designs.	16:00:25
7	Q. You didn't subtract out revenues for online	16:00:30
8	car sales; correct?	16:00:33
9	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	16:00:36
10	A. Yeah, again, I don't recall seeing a line of	16:00:41
11	revenues from online car sales.	16:00:48
12	Q. So as I understand it, your calculation was	16:00:50
13	based on the Bloomberg data but did not account for	16:00:59
14	the possibility or the reality that Wirtualna Polska	16:01:06
15	was receiving revenue from these other sources that	16:01:11
16	are not online advertising, like tourist services,	16:01:15
17	architectural designs, and car sales; is that	16:01:19
18	correct?	16:01:23
19	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	16:01:23
20	A. Again, this is not what I focused on in	16:01:28
21	doing it. I would need to go back and look at the	16:01:32
22	breakout in the financial statements, and I do not	16:01:38
23	believe that these were listed as having any revenue	16:01:43
24	in the numbers that were reported for revenue.	16:01:49
25	Q. Did you do anything to investigate what	16:01:53

2	1	1
_	Z	4

		1
1	portion of Wirtualna Polska's revenues are	16:01:57
2	attributable to sales of tourist services, sale of	16:02:01
3	architectural designs, or online car sales?	16:02:06
4	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	16:02:10
5	A. Again, I don't recall seeing anywhere any	16:02:17
6	values associated with any of those categories.	16:02:25
7	Q. Right. My question was, did you do anything	16:02:28
8	to look into what the values might be for those	16:02:30
9	categories before you assigned a hundred percent of	16:02:34
10	the revenue to advertising?	16:02:37
11	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	16:02:41
12	A. Okay. Again, I just I did the used	16:02:52
13	the Bloomberg number and then checked that against	16:02:56
14	the financial statements. And, again, I don't	16:03:01
15	believe there was any other lines in revenue that	16:03:07
16	would have indicated further.	16:03:14
17	Q. Sir, my question my question was, did you	16:03:19
18	do anything to look into whether or not the values	16:03:23
19	would be the revenue would be for those other	16:03:32
20	categories besides online advertising?	16:03:34
21	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	16:03:39
22	A. Again, I looked at the line items that were	16:03:43
23	disclosed for advertising, and I don't believe there	16:03:50
24	were any other categories that were listed.	16:04:01
25	Q. All right. Again, focus on my question.	16:04:11
		4

1	A. Right.	16:13:19
2	MS. LAWRENCE: Object object to form.	16:13:20
3	Q. So you don't know whether, if you actually	16:13:23
4	factored in all of the revenue sources for Wirtualna	16:13:25
5	Polska, whether they would have had 80 percent of	16:13:30
6	their revenue attributable to advertising revenue or	16:13:33
7	not?	16:13:35
8	You do not know the answer to that question,	16:13:36
9	do you?	16:13:39
10	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	16:13:41
11	A. Again, I don't I don't have information	16:13:45
12	to assign values to these categories which you're	16:13:49
13	showing me on page 17.	16:13:54
14	Q. Right. So you also don't know whether if	16:13:55
15	you considered those categories and the revenue that	16:13:58
16	they gave to they attributed to Wirtualna Polska,	16:14:01
17	whether or not it would have more than 80 percent of	16:14:05
18	its revenues associated with advertising?	16:14:07
19	You do not know the answer to that question,	16:14:11
20	do you?	16:14:13
21	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	16:14:13
22	A. Well, as I sit here, I'm not sure, but I	16:14:23
23	don't believe that there was information on revenue	16:14:39
24	in these during this time period from those	16:14:42
25	various categories.	16:14:46

		1
1	Q. Right. I'm not asking whether or not there	16:14:48
2	was information that you had available to you. I'm	16:14:50
3	asking you to confirm that you don't know whether or	16:14:52
4	not Wirtualna Polska had more than 80 percent of its	16:14:58
5	revenues associated with advertising during the	16:15:00
6	class period, because you don't know how much these	16:15:03
7	other sources contributed to its revenue; isn't that	16:15:05
8	right?	16:15:09
9	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	16:15:09
10	A. Again, I don't know there was no	16:15:15
11	quantification associated with them, so I cannot	16:15:18
12	say, you know, what they were or if they were	16:15:25
13	material or not.	16:15:27
14	Q. Now, one of your yardstick firms another	16:15:29
15	one of your yardstick firms was Weibo; right?	16:15:34
16	A. Yes.	16:15:38
17	Q. And you understand that Weibo has	16:15:38
18	connections to the Chinese government; right?	16:15:42
19	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	16:15:45
20	A. Well, I understand they operate in China, so	16:15:47
21	yes, there's going to be certain requirements for	16:15:51
22	doing business there, yes.	16:15:55
23	Q. Did you do anything to analyze what impact	16:15:57
24	Weibo's connections with the Chinese government have	16:16:01
25	on its revenue, market cap, or other financial	16:16:04

1	metrics that you considered for your yardstick	16:16:09
2	analysis?	16:16:13
3	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	16:16:13
4	A. No. Again, I didn't I just for these	16:16:18
5	things, I calculated the economic profits. I didn't	16:16:24
6	go in and try to assign to various sources.	16:16:28
7	Q. Did you consider the impact of the	16:16:36
8	relationship between Weibo and the Chinese	16:16:38
9	government on the specific six criteria that you	16:16:41
10	evaluated?	16:16:45
11	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	16:16:45
12	A. Well, I'm not sure what relevance it would	16:16:57
13	have to the size or the industry categorization. So	16:17:04
14	I don't think any of these six criteria would be	16:17:11
15	something that I would need to consider the Chinese	16:17:19
16	government in assessing.	16:17:22
17	Q. You don't think that the the relationship	16:17:23
18	between Weibo and the Chinese government might	16:17:25
19	impact its market capitalization?	16:17:28
20	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	16:17:33
21	Q. That's your testimony?	16:17:35
22	A. I didn't I did not look, when you say	16:17:41
23	the value the market capitalization, it's a	16:17:49
24	number. These these companies are sold in the	16:17:52
25	Marketplace. They have X number of shares. You	16:17:55

1	quickly.	16:21:25
2	MS. LAWRENCE: That's okay.	16:21:25
3	Q. Did you quantify what the differences would	16:21:28
4	be on your EPR based on the differences between the	16:21:30
5	IFRS standard and the GAP standard that's used for	16:21:35
6	Meta?	16:21:39
7	A. Well, the GAP standard would show things as	16:21:43
8	expenses that would have been capitalized under the	16:21:55
9	international financial reporting standards. So	16:21:58
10	when I capitalize the expenses, I'm restating the	16:22:03
11	GAP statement in a similar way to manage the way	16:22:09
12	they are with ITEEA for standards. There's some	16:22:13
13	differences. They may have a residual value in	16:22:20
14	baseline or not. They tend to use, I think, time	16:22:26
15	periods similar to what I would use.	16:22:31
16	Q. I just asked a simple question.	16:22:35
17	Did you quantify those differences?	16:22:36
18	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	16:22:41
19	A. Again, I think that the I think the	16:22:42
20	results are very similar. Did I quantify the	16:22:46
21	difference as to what it would be, I would say	16:22:52
22	beyond, you know, knowing how they're done under the	16:22:59
23	IFRS standard, I didn't do any further adjustments.	16:23:06
24	I think that using the methodology, I think it	16:23:10
25	brings it in line with to be more comparable with	16:23:12

1	IFRS standards than GAP would be on its own.	16:23:18
2	Q. In all the work that you've done on this	16:23:22
3	case, have you found any document in which Meta has	16:23:24
4	called Weibo or Wirtualna Polska a competitor or a	16:23:30
5	comparable firm?	16:23:41
6	A. I don't recall any documents that I read	16:23:43
7	with Meta. Then again, I didn't really look at what	16:23:50
8	Meta considered to be competition.	16:23:58
9	Q. Have you in all the work that you've done	16:24:01
10	on the case, have you found any industry	16:24:03
11	publications or documents from anyone outside of	16:24:06
12	Meta comparing Meta's advertising business to Weibo	16:24:10
13	or Wirtualna Polska?	16:24:14
14	A. No, I don't recall seeing anything like	16:24:20
15	that.	16:24:22
16	Q. Are you aware of anyone other than you and	16:24:24
17	Dr. Williams describing Weibo or Wirtualna Polska as	16:24:27
18	comparable firms to Meta for its ad business?	16:24:32
19	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	16:24:39
20	A. Again, I did not look at what other people	16:24:44
21	were doing.	16:24:46
22	Q. Aside of whether you looked at that or not.	16:24:47
23	Are you aware of having worked on this	16:24:50
24	case, done all this analysis, are you aware of	16:24:52
25	anyone other than you and Dr. Williams ever	16:24:56

1	describing Weibo or Wirtualna Polska as comparable	16:24:58
2	firms to Meta for its ads business?	16:25:02
3	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	16:25:06
4	A. No.	16:25:07
5	MS. LAWRENCE: Standard objection.	16:25:09
6	Q. Would you agree with me that a yardstick	16:25:12
7	study should compare the studied firm to firms that	16:25:17
8	are unaffected by the alleged anticompetitive	16:25:21
9	conduct?	16:25:23
10	A. Okay. Now we're getting into again the	16:25:25
11	antitrust area, and that's that's not my field.	16:25:29
12	That's a question for Dr. Williams.	16:25:37
13	Q. Okay. Aside from the application of your	16:25:39
14	six selection criteria, did you do anything to	16:25:45
15	consider whether other firms were comparable to	16:25:49
16	Meta?	16:25:53
17	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	16:25:56
18	A. Well, I used the I used the screens and	16:25:59
19	the six criteria as described. That's how I arrived	16:26:13
20	at the potential competitors or the potential	16:26:17
21	yardstick firms.	16:26:19
22	Q. Right. I'm asking whether you looked at	16:26:20
23	anything else whether you did anything else. So	16:26:25
24	I understand you used your six criteria.	16:26:28
25	Aside from your six criteria, did you do	16:26:30

1	anything else to consider whether there were other	16:26:31
2	firms that were comparable to Meta?	16:26:33
3	A. I mean, normally, I would say there are some	16:26:44
4	firms I could think of that might be comparable.	16:26:52
5	Beyond that type of thing, no, I didn't it just	16:26:55
6	was I didn't do any additional searches for	16:26:58
7	companies. We applied the six criteria.	16:27:02
8	Q. And in terms of companies that you might	16:27:06
9	think of that are comparable, did you do anything to	16:27:08
10	analyze their comparability other than just applying	16:27:10
11	your six criteria?	16:27:13
12	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	16:27:15
13	A. Let me get rid of this. Okay. Can I get	16:27:20
14	that question again? I'm getting a little tired of	16:27:31
15	the exhibit.	16:27:35
16	Q. Yes. The question was, in terms you said	16:27:35
17	in your prior answer that there were companies that	16:27:38
18	you might think of as comparable.	16:27:41
19	And my question was: In terms of those	16:27:43
20	companies, did you do anything to analyze their	16:27:45
21	comparability other than the application of your six	16:27:47
22	criteria?	16:27:51
23	A. No, I can't think I mean, generally, I'll	16:27:54
24	look at that and say, well, you know, here's my	16:28:02
25	here's my criteria. Is there something I can think	16:28:06

1	of that should be a comp that wasn't picked up? I	16:28:09
2	didn't find any companies like that that didn't make	16:28:14
3	it through our consideration. So I'm just saying,	16:28:17
4	in general, that's been my approach to looking at	16:28:22
5	comps, to do a criteria check on the mechanism for	16:28:25
6	finding the comparable companies.	16:28:32
7	Q. I think we already established that	16:28:33
8	LinkedIn, which is a part of Microsoft, didn't make	16:28:36
9	it through your selection criteria; right?	16:28:38
10	A. Yes.	16:28:42
11	Q. Did you do anything else to evaluate the	16:28:42
12	comparability of LinkedIn?	16:28:47
13	A. No.	16:28:48
14	Q. Amazon didn't make it through your selection	16:28:50
15	criteria; right?	16:28:54
16	A. No.	16:28:55
17	Q. Is that correct?	16:28:56
18	A. Yes.	16:28:58
19	Q. Did you do anything to evaluate the	16:28:59
20	comparability of Amazon's ads business?	16:29:01
21	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	16:29:04
22	Q. Besides that.	16:29:06
23	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	16:29:08
24	A. No, I did not. I did not again, the	16:29:09
25	Amazon's main business is not financed by selling	16:29:17
		1

1	ads.	16:29:24
2	Q. That wasn't my question, sir. My question	16:29:24
3	was, other than applying your six selection	16:29:26
4	criteria, did you do anything to evaluate the	16:29:29
5	comparability of Amazon's ads business?	16:29:32
6	A. No.	16:29:34
7	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	16:29:34
8	Q. Other than applying your six criteria, did	16:29:36
9	you do anything to evaluate the comparability of	16:29:39
10	Apple's ads business?	16:29:41
11	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	16:29:43
12	A. No. I did not do additional evaluation of	16:29:43
13	companies that failed to make it through the	16:29:55
14	filters.	16:29:58
15	Q. Other than applying your six filters, did	16:30:00
16	you do anything to evaluate the comparability of	16:30:04
17	Twitter's ad business?	16:30:07
18	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	16:30:10
19	A. No. Twitter did not make it through the	16:30:13
20	screen.	16:30:19
21	Q. Now, Reddit was not something that you	16:30:21
22	considered because it was not it's not a publicly	16:30:23
23	traded company; right?	16:30:27
24	A. I don't know that much about Reddit,	16:30:29
25	whether I'm assuming it's not publicly traded	16:30:37
		1

1	because you just said so, but I would not have said	16:30:41
2	whether Reddit is public or private off the top of	16:30:44
3	my head.	16:30:47
4	Q. Fair enough. Is it fair to say that, other	16:30:49
5	than applying your selection criteria, you didn't do	16:30:51
6	any analysis of the comparability of Reddit?	16:30:53
7	A. Yes.	16:30:57
8	Q. Would that also be true for Tencent?	16:30:58
9	A. Let's see. Tencent, yeah, I don't remember.	16:31:04
10	I don't recall where that failed in the screen	16:31:15
11	but	16:31:18
12	Q. Would it also be true for ByteDance?	16:31:18
13	A. What company?	16:31:24
14	Q. ByteDance?	16:31:25
15	A. ByteDance? I don't recall that so I'm going	16:31:26
16	to say I have not done any further analysis of	16:31:33
17	ByteDance.	16:31:36
18	Q. Did you conduct any analysis of Google's	16:31:37
19	advertising business model in terms of its	16:31:41
20	comparability to Meta's advertising business model?	16:31:44
21	A. Well, they were both internet-based. They	16:31:57
22	were based on using information to target ads, so I	16:32:04
23	did you know, I understand Google pretty well.	16:32:11
24	It appeared to be very close. I'm not sure what	16:32:17
25	other analysis you're referring to.	16:32:22

1	Q. Well, since you say you know Google very	16:32:24
2	well, you're aware, then, that Google serves ads on	16:32:27
3	third-party websites; right?	16:32:32
4	A. Yes. So Google has other lines of business,	16:32:36
5	but their main business is selling ads.	16:32:46
6	Q. Well, I'm talking about selling ads on	16:32:50
7	for display on third-party websites. You're aware	16:32:54
8	of that; right?	16:32:57
9	A. Yes.	16:32:59
10	Q. Do you know what the financial arrangement	16:33:01
11	is between Google and those third-party sites in	16:33:03
12	terms of the revenue that's generated from those	16:33:06
13	ads?	16:33:09
14	A. Off the top of my head, I couldn't say what	16:33:10
15	their typical deal would be with this.	16:33:20
16	Q. Now, you understand that Meta doesn't have	16:33:24
17	to share any of the revenues for ads that it serves	16:33:28
18	on its own properties, Facebook and Instagram, with	16:33:31
19	third parties; right?	16:33:34
20	A. I can't really definitively say, you know,	16:33:40
21	yes or no, that they would do that.	16:33:45
22	Q. Did you consider where did you consider	16:33:49
23	what the profitability of Google's ad business is	16:33:54
24	considering that it has to share revenues for ads it	16:33:58
25	places on third-party sites?	16:34:03

		i
1	whether or not those accounted for revenue that	16:50:36
2	would have been more than 20 percent of Wirtualna	16:50:39
3	Polska's total revenue during the class period, you	16:50:43
4	actually don't know the answer to that, do you?	16:50:48
5	A. I don't know exactly where it would fall.	16:50:51
6	Indications are it was not material. And	16:50:57
7	indications that it only became material after a	16:51:00
8	series of acquisitions in that's other lines of	16:51:04
9	business.	16:51:06
10	Q. Well, that's your assumption based on what	16:51:07
11	they were reporting and when they were reporting it.	16:51:11
12	You actually don't know what the revenue was for the	16:51:13
13	nonadvertising segments of Wirtualna Polska's	16:51:17
14	business during the class period, do you?	16:51:20
15	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	16:51:23
16	A. Okay. So, again, I don't know exactly what	16:51:26
17	that percentage would be because that information	16:51:28
18	was not provided.	16:51:35
19	Q. Right. And, in fact, based on the 2020	16:51:36
20	annual report, we know that those nonadvertising	16:51:42
21	segments existed prior to the acquisitions that you	16:51:45
22	pointed to in 2021 and 2022?	16:51:49
23	A. Yeah. Uh-huh.	16:51:52
24	Q. Okay. Let's was that a yes to the last	16:51:53
25	question?	16:52:03
		1

1	MS. LAWRENCE: Before he answers, I was	16:52:04
2	going to object to form. Object to form.	16:52:05
3	Then answer.	16:52:07
4	Q. You said, "Yeah, uh-huh." I think that's a	16:52:08
5	yes?	16:52:11
6	A. I think that's a yes. I'm getting a little	16:52:11
7	bit worn down at this point in time.	16:52:14
8	Q. Your best testimony to that question is yes,	16:52:17
9	isn't it?	16:52:21
10	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	16:52:22
11	A. Yes.	16:52:22
12	Q. Okay. A couple odds and ends I wanted to	16:52:23
13	just finalize here.	16:52:30
14	In evaluating your or conducting your	16:52:32
15	analysis in this case, did you do anything to break	16:52:38
16	down Meta's advertising business between social	16:52:43
17	advertising and nonsocial advertising?	16:52:47
18	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	16:52:50
19	A. Okay. No. Once again, I just took the	16:52:56
20	advertising revenue and the expenses and calculated	16:53:04
21	the economic profits.	16:53:09
22	Q. And you did not distinguish between social	16:53:10
23	and nonsocial advertising; correct?	16:53:14
24	A. I did not.	16:53:16
25	Q. And is that also true for the other firms	16:53:18
		1

_	4	c
,	4	u

		i
1	you evaluated, you did not distinguish between	16:53:20
2	social and nonsocial advertising for any of the	16:53:25
3	other firms; is that correct?	16:53:27
4	A. Yeah, I don't recall any that I would have	16:53:29
5	made that distinction. Again, I was looking at the	16:53:33
6	revenues and expenses and capital and calculating	16:53:38
7	economic profits.	16:53:41
8	Q. Now, you did testify earlier that in	16:53:42
9	evaluating comparability, at least for criteria 6,	16:53:46
10	you were looking at targeted advertising.	16:53:50
11	Do you recall that?	16:53:53
12	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	16:53:55
13	A. That was the targeted advertising is a term	16:53:57
14	I use to mean that I was advertising based on	16:54:14
15	information created through the business of the	16:54:17
16	company.	16:54:22
17	Q. Did you do anything to evaluate social	16:54:23
18	versus nonsocial advertising when it came to	16:54:27
19	criteria number 6, selection criteria number 6?	16:54:30
20	A. No.	16:54:33
21	Q. At what point did you come up with your list	16:54:37
22	of yardstick firms, what date?	16:54:42
23	MS. LAWRENCE: Object to form.	16:54:47
24	A. You mean at what when did we do this? I	16:54:55
25	don't remember exactly. Certainly sometime before	16:55:05
		1

1	CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER-NOTARY PUBLIC
2	
3	I, Tiffany M. Pietrzyk, CSR RPR CRR, the
4	officer before whom the foregoing deposition was
5	taken, do hereby certify that the foregoing
6	transcript is a true and correct record of the
7	testimony given; that said testimony was taken by me
8	stenographically and thereafter reduced to
9	typewriting under my direction; that reading and
10	signing was not requested; and that I am neither
11	counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the
12	parties to this case and have no interest, financial
13	or otherwise, in its outcome.
14	
15	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
16	hand and affixed my notarial seal this 3rd of
17	October, 2023.
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	Siffaym. Kuterylo
23	My commission expires:
24	February 28th, 2024
25	